

# *The* AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*Vol. LI, No. 3*

*April, 1946*

---

## The Problem of the Common Man in Early Medieval Europe

CARL STEPHENSON\*

FOR over a hundred years no subject of historical research has attracted greater interest or has been more passionately discussed than the ordinary inhabitant of the Western countryside during the early Middle Ages. Of what descent was he, and of what fundamental character? Was he free or unfree? Was he a peasant proprietor or an economic dependent? Did he live by fighting, by working, or by combining the two occupations? Did he have any political power? If so, what was it; and how and where was it exercised? Such questions as these must indeed be answered by one who hopes to understand the development of European civilization. We should, as so many generations of scholars have insisted, give thought to the beginnings of our nations, our states, and our societies. But the task of finding good answers to the questions is not easy; for the curious student who works back of the glib statements in most popular histories is confronted by a mass of abstruse writ-

\*The author is professor of history in Cornell University.

ing that inevitably tends to discourage him. He will not know that the substratum of actual evidence is much less bulky and, as it seems to me, much more intelligible. At any rate, let us see whether something cannot be done to simplify what the historian of medieval Europe has long considered a fundamental problem.

Once we have attacked this problem, we can hardly escape the *Markgenossenschaft*, a topic which the reader of current historical journals is not likely to find exciting. A century or so ago, the situation was very different—as we soon discover if, with Alfons Dopsch,<sup>1</sup> we trace the various theories of the *Markgenossenschaft* to their earliest formulation. It was in 1768 that Justus Möser published the first edition of his *Osnabrückische Geschichte*.<sup>2</sup> Here he depicted his native land, the old Saxony of pre-Carolingian times, as having been populated by free German peasants who, within the confines of local territories (*Marken*), were joined in voluntary associations for the sake of common economic and political interests. Through direct assemblies these associates (*Markgenossen*) regulated their pastoral and agricultural pursuits, electing headmen to enforce their decisions and to lead them in war. Theirs was a golden age of liberty and equality—one which, being dictated by nature, could dispense with an elaborately organized state, and which ineluctably ended with Charlemagne's conquest of Saxony.<sup>3</sup> Can anyone doubt that this idyllic society, so appealingly sketched in Möser's frontispiece,<sup>4</sup> was inspired by the tearful Jean Jacques? Thus to conclude, as a matter of fact, is not to rely on mere surmise. Möser himself declared that, after reading Voltaire and other authors, he was finally enthralled by Rousseau.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Wirtschaftliche und soziale Grundlagen der europäischen Kulturentwicklung* (Vienna, 1918). Translated and condensed by Erna Patzelt (New York, 1937). The following references are to the original edition.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 8 ff. For the sake of comparison it may be remarked that Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* was first published in 1748; Rousseau's *Discours sur les arts et sciences* in 1750; his *Contrat social* in 1762; and Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Menschheit* in 1784–91.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Möser (2d ed., Berlin, 1780), I, 11 ff., 83 ff. Note also the division, in his preface, of German history into four periods. "In der ersten und güldnen war noch mehrentheils jeder deutscher Ackerhof mit einem Eigenthümer oder Wehren besetzt; . . . nichts als hohe und gemeine Ehre in der Nation bekannt; niemand, ausser dem Leut oder Knechte einem Herrn zu folgen verbunden; und der gemeine Vorsteher ein erwählter Richter, welcher blos die Urtheile bestätigte, so ihm von seinen Rechtsgenossen zugewiesen wurden."

<sup>4</sup> See the accompanying plate, which has been reproduced from Möser's second edition because no copy of the first seems to be available in America. Here may be admired the warrior-peasant of primitive Germany in a romantic setting that includes his wife and child (and presumably the wife and children of a neighbor). His spear and shield, ready to hand, recline in the foreground, while he strives to till his recalcitrant soil. We notice that his hair—in a hardly successful attempt to illustrate the coiffure of the Suevi, as described by Tacitus—is tied in a topknot, and that his plow is distinctly crude. But how are we to explain his team of long-tailed horses, his greyhound, and—God save the mark—his shorts?

<sup>5</sup> "Zuletzt zog mich Rousseau ganz an sich." Quoted from one of Möser's letters by Georg Kass, *Möser und Goethe* (Berlin, 1909), p. 21.



The Original *Markgenosse* (frontispiece of Möser's  
*Osnabrückische Geschichte*, 1780)

How, in turn, Möser's work captivated the rising school of German historians has been admirably shown by Dopsch,<sup>6</sup> and with such a wealth of detail that only the salient features of this famous literary development need be mentioned here. Möser, we should note, attributed to the ancient *Markgenossenschaft* both economic and political functions, the latter being necessitated by the former. To Möser the typical German was the possessor of an individual homestead (*Einzelhof*), who shared with his *Markgenossen* the use of adjacent woods, streams, pastures, and the like.<sup>7</sup> It was left for Möser's followers in the next century—particularly Eichhorn, Grimm, Beseler, Landau, and Georg von Maurer—to transform his thesis of original private ownership into one of original communism. In doing so the later writers were undoubtedly influenced by their better appreciation of the open-field system and the accompanying allotment of peasant holdings within the medieval villa, or manor. Thus the village, rather than a group of *Einzelhofen*, came to be recognized as the primitive *Mark*—the natural settlement of free warrior-peasants with an innate passion for equal justice, the true cell of Germanic society.<sup>8</sup> And since Germanic society had to be based on the sacred principle of consanguinity, numerous scholars arose to show how the *Markgenossenschaft* was somehow derived from the *uralt* institution of the family.<sup>9</sup>

Meanwhile Möser's exposition of the *Markgenossenschaft* as the primeval form of political organization among the Germans had likewise met with enthusiastic reception. Such influential writers as Rogge and Dönniges went even beyond Eichhorn in arguing that the German state was originally democratic. Its later domination by a feudal aristocracy was the result of degeneration—marked the triumph of greed and violence over the liberty, equality, and pure self-government of ancient Germany. Several scholars,<sup>10</sup> it is true, refused to accept what they denounced as an obvious exaggeration; and their demand for more positive evidence received strong support from Georg Waitz, one of the great historians of all time.<sup>11</sup> Yet Waitz remained

<sup>6</sup> I, 10 ff. His work should be consulted for all references not given in the pages immediately following.

<sup>7</sup> Note that Möser, while restricting his book to a consideration of ancient Saxony, devoted his preface mainly to determining periods in *die Geschichte von Deutschland*, and that his disciples, led by Eichhorn, applied his conclusions to Germany as a whole.

<sup>8</sup> Hence August Meitzen's *Siedlung und Agrarwesen*, which set forth the persuasive theory that the nucleated village was essentially Germanic, the *Einzelhof* essentially Celtic.

<sup>9</sup> Hence the thesis of W. Arnold and others (following Kemble, below, n. 31), that place names reflect the primitive settlement of families or clans.

<sup>10</sup> Notably W. E. Wilda and H. von Sybel.

<sup>11</sup> In this verdict I heartily agree with Dopsch. Waitz proved himself a fine historical scholar by basing his conclusions on the study of authentic sources. Whenever we disagree with him, we must present equally good reasons for doing so. Most of his contemporaries, like too many of



firmly convinced that the *Markgenossenschaft* was the basic institution of Germanic society, an agrarian association that might well have had political functions of a local character. The debate then became more intricate as well as more acrimonious. Thudicum defended Maurer's thesis by presenting further alleged proofs from late sources. Roth, Gierke, and Sohm upheld Waitz in some particulars only to differ with him in others—while by no means agreeing among themselves.<sup>12</sup>

For the present study these disputes have relatively slight importance. Our interest in the *Markgenossenschaft* lies not in its probable significance for state-building but in its presumed existence. If there never was any such thing, why bother with an estimate of its potential influence? To Fustel de Coulanges goes the honor of having first appreciated the underlying problem and of having boldly attacked it. In his essay "De la marche germanique"<sup>13</sup> he briefly stated the thesis of the Germanist school,<sup>14</sup> examined the relevant sources, and gave his own conclusions. So far as it went, in my opinion, his judgment was decisive. Throughout the extant documents of the earlier Middle Ages the word "mark" (*marca*) invariably means a boundary. It is only in the land grants of the twelfth and following centuries that it sometimes designates a particular property, such as a villa; and descriptions of these properties often include the term *communia*. But the latter does not imply communal ownership by villagers. It denotes merely a piece of land, e.g. a wood, which, at least to some extent, is jointly used by various persons and which can only be alienated subject to their rights of common. To accept the current doctrine of the *Markgenossenschaft*, accordingly, one must first read into comparatively late sources a meaning which they never had and then apply that misinterpretation to an imaginary society of a thousand years earlier.<sup>15</sup>

Fustel's argument, however cogent it may appear to us, had surprisingly little effect upon the learned world of his day. French historians, angered by

---

ours, seem to have thought that historical truth could be found through juristic theorizing. In my *Borough and Town* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), pp. 5, 11, I have explained why I prefer Waitz to Maurer on the subject of urban origins.

<sup>12</sup> For a discussion of the controversy between Waitz and Roth over the development of feudalism, see my earlier article, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVI (1941), 788 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire* (Paris, 1885), pp. 319 ff. These were studies which Fustel had earlier written to supplement the first volume of his *Histoire des institutions de l'ancienne France* (Paris, 1874), but which he had not separately published. It is greatly to be regretted that the writing of so brilliant a scholar never caught up with his research.

<sup>14</sup> The authorities referred to by Fustel are principally such German historians as Maurer, Waitz, and Sohm, together with the French historian, E. L. V. de Laveleye, whose *Histoire des formes primitives de la propriété* had been published in 1874. On the contemporary work of Seebohm (unnoticed by Fustel), see below, n. 33.

<sup>15</sup> The words are my own; Fustel was much less emphatic.

his delineation of the early Germans as rather better than savages, seemed more inclined to attack than to support anything he said.<sup>16</sup> German historians, to whom the works of the French school had long been anathema, generally disregarded him. And English historians, with few exceptions, refused to be perturbed by the criticism of any foreigner. It must, indeed, have been very gratifying to the many exponents of nationalistic history that Fustel could be said to have proved merely the inadequacy of the word "mark." So, to escape the rigor of his logic, all one had to do was to substitute *commune rurale*, *Landgemeinde*, "village community," or "township." Yet the question remains whether such substitution really adds to our knowledge. To give the *Markgenossenschaft* a new name is not to demonstrate its existence. Although Fustel died prematurely, and without adequate recognition, no student can do better than take his work as a model of historical criticism. Let us see, more precisely, what a few typical writers of the next generation were able to advance in favor of the good old Germanist doctrine.

Beginning in 1886, Jacques Flach published a history which, by virtue of its pleasing style rather than of its scholarship, has had considerable influence.<sup>17</sup> Flach's first volume, dealing with the emergence of *le régime seigneuriale*, is devoted to a romantic portrayal of the family as the governing factor in primitive French society. His second volume (1893) attempts to show how the same thesis can be developed to explain the institutions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries—especially *la commune* and *la féodalité*. Ignoring Flach's description of feudalism as being irrelevant to the present study, we need only remark that he finds the origin of the urban commune in the rural commune, which he manages to derive from Frankish institutions in Gaul and so, presumably, from earlier Germanic custom. To state Flach's argument more positively is quite impossible, as anybody who reads his book will quickly realize. His one sure conclusion would seem to be that Fustel de Coulanges was wrong; Germanic society had been characterized by the free self-governing community. Yet, to justify his faith in that institu-

<sup>16</sup> Dopsch has shown (I, 46) how both Glasson and Violette, avoiding Fustel's main argument, continued to defend the juristic thesis that primitive communism must have preceded individual ownership of land. For the works of other French historians, as well as for those of various German and English historians, see immediately below. It should be noted that at this point Dopsch, after an enthusiastic tribute to Fustel de Coulanges, diverts his chief attention to the broader subject of Germanic *Kulturentwicklung* upon Roman soil. So what follows is essentially my own criticism of the books cited.

<sup>17</sup> *Les origines de l'ancienne France* (4 vols., Paris, 1886-1917). By way of contrast C. Pfister's admirable chapters in E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, II, pt. 1 (Paris, 1903), not only accept Fustel's conclusions regarding the *Markgenossenschaft* but decline to imagine a substitute called *commune rurale* or anything else (see especially p. 204, n. 2). On the continued support to Maurer's theory of urban origins by Petit-Dutaillis, Bourgin, and others, see my *Borough and Town*, pp. 15, 18.

tion, Flach could refer to nothing earlier than the seignorially organized villas of the Carolingian period. To one who begins his inquiry without such faith, Flach's volumes, whatever their literary merit, remain wholly unconvincing.

In Germany, meanwhile, it had been Fustel's misfortune to have his work cited with approval by Richard Hildebrand, a professor of political economy who in 1896 published a sociological essay on the early stages of human culture.<sup>18</sup> According to Hildebrand, men were first hunters and fishers, secondly herdsman, thirdly peasants and landlords. Had the Germans, as pictured by Tacitus, approached the third stage? Assuredly not, for their agrarian system was still quite primitive. Even the most famous of German historians had failed to recognize that fact and had therefore imposed upon the scholarly world an opinion compounded of romantic imagination and a misreading of the sources.<sup>19</sup> More especially, the sacred doctrine of the *Markgenossenschaft* was no better than a myth!<sup>20</sup> Hildebrand was obviously inviting Jovian thunderbolts, and they descended in due course. Prominent historians joined in ridiculing not only his interpretation of Caesar and Tacitus but also his application of the sociologists' comparative method to the study of early German society.<sup>21</sup> And since a good deal of this criticism was not without justification, the arguments of Fustel de Coulanges tended to be discredited along with those of Hildebrand.

Long before Hildebrand's particular heresy could be refuted, however, a more insidious attack was launched against the dogma of the *Markgenossenschaft* by Werner Wittich, a pupil of the specialist on agrarian history, Georg Friedrich Knapp.<sup>22</sup> Under the inspiration of his distinguished master,

<sup>18</sup> *Recht und Sitte auf den verschiedenen wirtschaftlichen Kulturstufen* (Jena, 1896). Likewise appreciated by Hildebrand was the pioneer work of Denman Ross, *The Early History of Landholding among the Germans* (Boston, 1883), which had denied the whole theory of communism in the primitive *Markgenossenschaft*. See Dopsch, I, 44-45.

<sup>19</sup> "Die Zusammenstellung von 'liberté,' 'fraternité' und 'égalité,' von welcher sich humoristischer Weise auch deutsche Historiker haben anstecken lassen, um auf dieser Trias die 'germanische Urzeit' oder die 'älteste deutsche Agrarverfassung' aufzubauen, beruht auf reiner Ideologie und Phantasterei." Hildebrand, p. 125.

<sup>20</sup> "Von der 'geläufigen Vorstellung der alten deutschen Markgenossenschaft' bleibt gar nichts übrig: Das Ganze ist ein Hirngespinnst." *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>21</sup> Together with the works cited immediately below, see R. Kötzschke, "Die Gliederung der Gesellschaft bei den alten Deutschen," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, Neue Folge, II (1897-98), 269 ff. And for a good review of the whole question by a supporter of the orthodox position, see G. von Below, *Probleme der Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1926), chaps. 1-II. Below's restatement of Maurer's theory of urban origins, including the substitution of *Landgemeinde* for *Markgenossenschaft*, has been summarized in my *Borough and Town*, pp. 3 ff.

<sup>22</sup> Knapp's first book, on the emancipation of the German peasantry, was published in 1887. His second, *Grundherrschaft und Rittergut* (Leipzig, 1897), incorporated a series of earlier lectures and was in turn incorporated in his *Einführung in einige Hauptgebiete der Nationalökonomie* (Munich, 1925).

rather than of Fustel de Coulanges, Wittich in 1896 published a book on the development of great landed estates in northwestern Germany.<sup>23</sup> The bulk of his work, consisting of a dozen chapters, dealt with the landlords and peasants of the old Saxony from the later Middle Ages down to the nineteenth century. It was only in an appendix that Wittich raised the question whether the *Grundherrschaft* of that period had resulted from a medieval deterioration of society or had prevailed among the primitive Germans. The latter supposition Wittich declared to be the much more probable. As delineated by Caesar and Tacitus, German society was plainly an aristocracy, in which the warrior did not himself guide a plow. Although his income was primarily derived from agriculture, he was supported by the labor of servile dependents (*Knechten*). He was, in other words, a petty *Grundherr*. And if we turn to the *leges barbarorum*, said Wittich, we find additional evidence for the same conclusion. The *liberi homines*, who appear so prominently in those compilations, were not peasants but small landlords, some of whom had only to expand their holdings to become the great landlords of the subsequent age.

It was, of course, against Wittich that the thunderbolts were thenceforth directed. Recognized authorities on the legal and institutional history of Germany, led by Heinrich Brunner<sup>24</sup> and Richard Schröder,<sup>25</sup> proceeded to demolish as best they could the work of Knapp and all his school. The writings of Caesar and Tacitus, as well as the barbarian codes, were once more subjected to laborious analysis and commentary. The triumphant result, according to these same authorities, was that Wittich had utterly failed to prove his unorthodox thesis. The typical German, they insisted, had always been the common freeman, a warrior-peasant who customarily tilled his own soil when not actually engaged in fighting. Such *Gemeinfreien* truly constituted

<sup>23</sup> *Die Grundherrschaft in Nordwestdeutschland* (Leipzig, 1896), especially Anlage VI. During these same years P. Heck complicated the problem under discussion by advancing, with little success, the thesis that in the *leges barbarorum* of the Frankish period the men described as *liberi* or *ingenuiles* were really dependents, that the true *Gemeinfreie* were the *nobiles*. Anyone interested will find specific references to Heck's publications in the articles herewith cited.

<sup>24</sup> The first edition of Brunner's *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1887-92) in general supported Waitz with regard to the *Markgenossenschaft*. Brunner's article on "Nobiles und Gemeinfreie der karolingischen Volksrechte," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, XIX (1898), 76 ff., presented a detailed refutation of Heck, Knapp, and Wittich. And in a second article, *ibid.*, XXIII (1902), 193 ff., he replied to Wittich's rebuttal (see below, n. 26). A final summary of his argument then appeared in the second edition of the *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1906-28). That Brunner must be regarded as one of the dozen best historians of the early twentieth century is, I think, beyond dispute (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVI, 794 ff.)—but not because he continued to believe in the *Markgenossenschaft* and its typical member, the warrior-peasant (see my quotation, *ibid.*, XLVIII, 249, n. 21).

<sup>25</sup> The many editions of Schröder's *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, ending with the fifteenth (Berlin, 1932), have continued to defend the theory of the *Markgenossenschaft*. See also Schröder's criticism of Wittich in the *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, XXIV (1903), 347 ff.

the primitive German nation; for the nobles and serfs mentioned by Tacitus were but minor groups, relatively unimportant either politically or economically. Insofar as Germanic custom continued to prevail in the many barbarian states of the following centuries, the same social condition came to be reflected by the legal compilations then made. The common man was still a warrior-peasant of the old type; it was not until the Carolingian period that "feudalizing tendencies" began to bring about his long degradation.

Wittich, nevertheless, remained unconvinced. In an article in 1901, though hard pressed to meet all the arguments of his many antagonists, he stoutly maintained his original thesis.<sup>26</sup> Ultimately, he declared, the upholders of the traditional doctrine had little to fall back on but an unjustifiable interpretation of Tacitus. It was ingrained habit of thought that led them to read into the records of a primitive age such modern ideas as democracy and the nobility of toil.<sup>27</sup> When dealing with the meager sources of the early Middle Ages, nobody should pretend to arrive at more than hypothetical conclusions; he submitted merely that his opinion was better supported by the available evidence than that of his opponents. "Jedoch habe ich eingesehen, dass die Annahme von der alten Bauernfreiheit der Germanen nicht eigentlich auf einer wissenschaftlich begründeten Einsicht sondern auf einem nationalen und liberalen Glauben an ein 'güldenes' Zeitalter im Sinne Mösers beruht."<sup>28</sup> Wittich's challenge, it seems to me, deserves a fairer answer than it has ever received. Before extending our criticism in that direction, however, we must see what had meanwhile become the accepted belief of English historians.

How the theory of the *Markgenossenschaft* was popularized by Kemble, Freeman, and Stubbs, together with their many disciples in England and America, is so familiar a story that detailed recapitulation of their work is hardly needed here.<sup>29</sup> Kemble's enthusiasm for Anglo-Saxon literature nat-

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, XXII (1901), 245 ff.

<sup>27</sup> "Ein Schluss aus diesen zahlreichen übereinstimmenden Angaben des Schriftstellers auf die wirtschaftliche Thätigkeit oder besser Unthätigkeit der freien Männer scheint mir nicht nur erlaubt sondern geboten; dass der freie deutsche Mann, den Tacitus schildert, nicht selbst regelmässig den Pflug führte, wird wohl jeder Unbefangene zugeben. Brunner scheint es für etwas Unerhörtes zu halten, wenn man einer Volksklasse die eigene wirtschaftliche Thätigkeit abspricht. Auch hier sind wieder ganz moderne Anschauungen wirksam, ich meine die ungemessene Hochschätzung der wirtschaftlichen besonders der Handarbeit. Die ganz antike und mittelalterliche Welt ist nur verständlich, wenn man sich von der Anschauung, dass 'wirtschaftliche Arbeit adelt,' frei macht. Alle Erwerbsthätigkeit war ein schmutziges Geschäft, das der anständige Mensch nur nothgedrungen ergriff." *Ibid.*, XXII, 253-54.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, XXII, 264.

<sup>29</sup> In addition to what Dopsch has to say on the subject, see especially W. J. Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic* (London, 1900), pp. 39 ff. For my own opinions the reader is referred to my previous articles: *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVIII, 245 ff., and "The Beginnings of Representative Government in England," in *The Constitution Reconsidered*, ed. by Conyers Read (New York, 1938), pp. 25 ff.



urally led him, after studying at Göttingen, to accept the confident assertions of German historians with regard to the antiquities of his country as well as theirs.<sup>30</sup> So in his famous work, *The Saxons in England*,<sup>31</sup> he sought to impress his compatriots with the significance of the *Markgenossenschaft* throughout their national history. The measure of his success can still be discerned in almost every book that deals with early England. Stubbs, it is true, was too good a scholar to accept Kemble's thesis without grave reservation. Yet even Stubbs was so captivated by the Germanist doctrine that he tended to interpret all English history as having been dominated by the primitive institution of the township, which he described as the logical development of the *Markgenossenschaft*. It seems never to have troubled him that positive evidence for any such primitive institution was as completely lacking under the second name as under the first.<sup>32</sup>

Once again the adherents of the orthodox school were aided by the fact that their principal antagonist exposed himself to assault from the flank as well as from the front. Unlike Fustel de Coulanges, Frederic Seebohm adopted the method of arguing back "from the known to the unknown"—a method which had been continuously used to justify the theory of the *Markgenossenschaft*, and which Seebohm now used in an effort to refute it.<sup>33</sup> On the whole, it must be granted, Seebohm's argument was the more scholarly of the two; yet, because he cited a spurious charter and misinterpreted a few authentic documents, he could be said to have presented an utterly false thesis. Besides, by adducing Welsh and Scandinavian records of the later Middle Ages to explain the character of ancient tribal organization, he made himself still more vulnerable to the attack of historians suddenly grown con-

<sup>30</sup> Kemble should be gratefully remembered not only for his pioneer work in editing the Anglo-Saxon charters but also for his fine appreciation of the Anglo-Saxon poems—wonderful sources which have been neglected by too many English historians of later generations.

<sup>31</sup> 1st ed., London, 1848; 2d ed., London, 1876. Kemble's work was based on the thesis (p. 35) that the mark was "the original principle of settlement, prevalent either in England or on the continent of Europe, among the nations of Germanic blood." But to prove the existence of the mark in Britain he had to rely on the theoretical arguments of Eichhorn, Grimm, and Dönniges (cited above), together with a fanciful derivation of place names which has now been thoroughly discredited. See, among the more recent works, Dopsch, I, 265; *The Cambridge Economic History*, I (Cambridge, 1941), 35, 177; and F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1943), p. 23, n. 3, and p. 314, n. 1, together with the articles there cited.

<sup>32</sup> *The Constitutional History of England* (Oxford, 1903), I, 33 ff., 53 ff. This sixth edition made no essential change in the thesis presented by the first in 1873. Like Brunner, with whom he had so much in common, Stubbs naturally accepted Waitz as the greatest of the earlier authorities on Germanic institutions. He frequently referred also to the works of Georg von Maurer, Sohm, and others of the orthodox school; but never, one notes with regret, to those of Fustel de Coulanges. In my opinion, the remarks made over fifty years ago by Ashley (pp. 61 ff.) still remain valid.

<sup>33</sup> *The English Village Community* (London, 1883). References to Seebohm's later work, as well as to that of Chadwick, Corbett, and numerous other historians, will be found in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVIII, 250 ff.

scientious. Vinogradoff and Maitland, though by no means agreeing on the nature of the early village community, heartily joined in denying Seeböhm's major allegations.<sup>34</sup> And despite all that has been written to support his opinion in preference to Kemble's, most writers on early English institutions, consciously or unconsciously, hold an abiding faith in the *Markgenossenschaft*.<sup>35</sup>

For example, let us glance at what may justly be considered the last word on the subject—Mr. F. M. Stenton's *Anglo-Saxon England*.<sup>36</sup> "The starting-point of English social history" he declares to have been, "not the manor, but the community of free peasants."<sup>37</sup> In all the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms the *ceorl* was originally a rural freeholder.<sup>38</sup> The importance of the open-field system in "Old English agrarian life" may have been somewhat exaggerated; yet it was the village that "throughout Old English history . . . formed the basis of social organization."<sup>39</sup> Within the village the free *ceorlas* constituted not only an "economic association" but also some kind of political unit, because we have "a definite reason for believing in a primitive township-moot."<sup>40</sup> Nor was the *ceorl* a mere peasant; although "in all the recorded

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, XLVIII, 247 ff. Utter lack of evidence, Maitland concluded, must force us to reject the alleged self-governing township of the Anglo-Saxons; to hold that the primitive Germanic village was a purely agrarian community, which somehow operated without moot or elected officials. This concession to the heretical enemy Vinogradoff refused to make. He steadfastly reaffirmed his faith in Georg von Maurer's thesis and like him, of course, could adduce as proof nothing earlier than manorial records of the fourteenth century. Vinogradoff, it should be noted, was already a convinced believer in the *Markgenossenschaft* when he published his *Villeinage in England* (1892). And in 1902, before establishing residence in Britain, he collaborated with Brunner and Schröder in their attack upon Wittich (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Germanistische Abteilung, XXIII, 123 ff.).

<sup>35</sup> For the most entrancing picture of primitive Germanic society one should turn, not to the pages of Freeman and Stubbs, but to those of their disciple, John Richard Green, whose *History of the English People* was published in 1881. In the villages of the early Germans, he declared (I, 8, 12-13), "lay ready formed the social and political life which is round us in the England of to-day. A belt of forest or waste parted each from its fellow villages, and within this boundary or mark the 'township,' as the village was then called . . . formed a complete and independent body, though linked by ties which were strengthening every day to the townships about it and the tribe of which it formed a part." The "sovereignty of the settlement" resided in its moot, the assembly of its component freemen. "Here new settlers were admitted to the freedom of the township, and bye-laws framed and headman and tithing-man chosen for its governance. Here plough-land and meadow-land were shared in due lot among the villagers, and field and home-stead passed from man to man by the delivery of a turf cut from its soil. Here strife of farmer with farmer was settled according to the 'customs' of the township as its elder men stated them, and four men were chosen to follow headman or ealdorman to hundred-court or war. It is with a reverence such as is stirred by the sight of the head-waters of some mighty river that one looks back to these village-moots of Friesland or Sleswick. It was here that England learned to be a 'mother of parliaments.'" Thus, obviously, the lyrical Green portrayed the *Markgenossenschaft*, under the name of township, as the germ of the glorious English constitution.

<sup>36</sup> The second volume of *The Oxford History of England* (Oxford, 1943). What follows is an elaboration of my brief remarks in the *Journal of Economic History*, IV (1944), 216 ff.

<sup>37</sup> Stenton, p. 310.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 274-75.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 278, 283.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 283-85. Mr. Stenton's "definite reason" is the fact that villages were commonly assessed in round numbers of hides long before there was a hundred court to make the assessment. But the hundred court of the tenth century is known to have inherited most of its functions

fighting of Anglo-Saxon history the typical warrior is the man of noble birth, . . . there are facts which suggest that the *ceorl* may have been by no means negligible as a fighting-man."<sup>41</sup> And the "urgent necessity for some form of assembly intermediate between the meeting of the whole folk and the meeting of a village community" naturally led to the institution of moots for the *regiones* later called hundreds, where "peasants learned in the law" rendered judgments according to popular custom.<sup>42</sup> Albeit with some little hesitance, Mr. Stenton thus proclaims himself more orthodox even than Maitland.<sup>43</sup> After all, Mr. Stenton decides, Vinogradoff's thesis remains sound—and that, of course, was essentially the thesis of Georg von Maurer and his romantic precursors.

However bold it may seem to question the considered judgments of great historians, one is always justified in asking them to cite their evidence. In a previous article I have tried to give an honest summary of what the sources tell us about the classes of people in early England and have arrived at conclusions quite different from those of Mr. Stenton's recent book. And nothing presented there has led me to change my opinions. I still believe that the Anglo-Saxon sources—the dooms as well as the poems and other literary works—portray an aristocratic rather than a democratic society. I fail to find in them the slightest evidence for a self-governing township or for the warrior-peasant who is alleged to have been its typical citizen. The *ceorl*, to be sure, was legally free; but precisely what did his freedom amount to? Did he till his own land, or that of someone else?<sup>44</sup> Even when he could be styled a proprietor, was he not generally commended to a lord and therefore bound, together with his children, to what the Normans called a manor?<sup>45</sup> Was a village inhabited by such *ceorlas* a "free" village? If so, what document proves its existence—as against the hundreds which prove that, from the

---

from the local *folcgemot* of the earlier dooms, and it was not a "township-moot"; see Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Halle, 1903-16), II, 449 ff. ("Gericht"), 516 ff. ("hundred"). In further support of his conclusion Mr. Stenton cites Elizabeth B. Demarest's article in the *English Historical Review*, XXXIII (1918), 62 ff.; though not one of mine, in which I tried to show that Domesday provides no sure example of hidation applied to the king's *feorm* (*ibid.*, XXXIX [1924], 161 ff.).

<sup>41</sup> Stenton, p. 287. The single reference provided here is to a few dubious words in a traditional life of St. Cuthbert.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294-95.

<sup>43</sup> See above, n. 34. To account for the growth of manorial economy and the concomitant degradation of the *ceorl*, Mr. Stenton naturally follows both Vinogradoff and Maitland.

<sup>44</sup> In this connection note particularly the verdict of Liebermann, quoted in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVIII, 254.

<sup>45</sup> It seems to me that the evidence of Domesday, as well as that of the earlier sources, tends to make such a conclusion necessary; see my "Commendation and Related Problems in Domesday," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LIX (1944), 289 ff.

seventh century on, whole villages were regularly bought, sold, and otherwise alienated?

As students of early Germanic institutions have long acknowledged, the Anglo-Saxon sources cannot be matched by any contemporary series on the Continent. Why, then, should English historians persistently accept the governing ideas which nationalists of nineteenth century Germany chose to derive from late medieval documents? The constant repetition by modern scholars of an argument originally devised to justify faith in the *Mark-genossenschaft* must lead one to suspect that too many of them have neglected to read the work of Fustel de Coulanges, or to examine for themselves the records of the Frankish period. To the latter subject we shall presently return. Meanwhile, here is another pertinent question: Why should our recognized authorities on pre-Norman England require us to believe that the Danish conquests of the ninth century necessarily resulted in the democratization of eastern Britain?<sup>46</sup> It may, indeed, be imagined that the typical Viking was a warrior-peasant who, in his isolated northland, had preserved the customs of a primitive Germany. But is there any historical evidence for that supposition?

We need only consult the index of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*<sup>47</sup> to discover that the oldest Scandinavian literature provides us with a single reference to plowing. This reference is to the famous *Rigspula*, which tells how the god Rig spent three nights in each of three homes, always sleeping between host and hostess; and how, in due time, the three wives brought forth three children. The first was Thrall (*þrael*, Anglo-Saxon *þeow*). A swarthy fellow with ugly features, thick hands, and broad back, Thrall spent his life in putting up fences, spreading manure, cutting peat, and herding animals. The second was ruddy-faced Karl (Anglo-Saxon *ceorl*), who properly learned to break an ox, guide a plow, make useful tools, and build a house or barn. The third was Jarl (Anglo-Saxon *eorl*). He had blond hair, rosy cheeks, and eyes as keen as a serpent's. He took to shaping the shield, stringing and bending the bow, shafting arrows, wielding and hurling the spear, riding horses, training hounds, brandishing the sword, and swimming the sea. Finally, having been recognized by Rig as his true son, Jarl became a landed gentleman,<sup>48</sup> a warrior who gloried in battle and reddened the field with the

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, LIX, 308, n. 6.

<sup>47</sup> Edited by Gudbrand Vigfusson and F. York Powell (Oxford, 1883). For the *Rigspula*, with an English translation and commentary, see I, 234 ff., 514 ff.; and for scanty references to other poems, II, 702 ("Agriculture"). A considerable part of the following summary is translated from the original poem.

<sup>48</sup> Literally a holder of *udal*-fields, or inherited land; see F. Seebohm, *Tribal Custom in Anglo-Saxon Law* (London, 1902), pp. 271 ff.

blood of slain foes. He conquered and ruled over eighteen country estates (*buom*). He distributed largess—steeds, golden rings, and other treasure. I am convinced that this grand poem, whether written in the ninth century or somewhat later, faithfully portrays Viking society.<sup>49</sup> That it was as aristocratic as Anglo-Saxon society I therefore see no reason for doubting.

The present study, however, has primarily to do with Continental Europe; we still have the task of reviewing the evidence presented by Tacitus and the writings of the Frankish age. This task, it seems to me, can be simplified by recognizing that a number of subjects, though related, are quite subordinate to the one under discussion. In the first place, we may profitably ignore the classification of particular institutions as Roman, Celtic, Germanic, or something else; for such classification must follow, rather than precede, a good understanding of what the institution was. We are not especially interested in the technical distinctions of the law, except insofar as they may reflect important differences of social status. Ancient tribal arrangements, in spite of their undoubted influence upon later custom, need not detain us. And we may disregard even the question whether settlement within a certain region was commonly in nucleated villages or in scattered homesteads. As neither form was incompatible with manorial organization in the Middle Ages, so neither can be peculiarly associated with any more primitive system, manorial or nonmanorial. In other words, our central problem is the alleged warrior-peasant of Möser's frontispiece.

That illustrious character of historical literature can hardly be found in the writings of Tacitus except by one who already believes he must be there. The candid reader, I think, will inevitably see in the *Germania* the picture of an aristocracy—a people dominated by a class of warriors who, far from being also peasants, regarded agricultural labor as degrading. In this respect I heartily agree with the conclusion of Wittich noted above<sup>50</sup> and with that more recently stated by Marc Bloch.<sup>51</sup> If, indeed, the status of the primitive German was determined by military prowess, and if the German ideal was

<sup>49</sup> In this respect the opinion of earlier writers (notably Vigfusson) has been supported by such modern writers as Axel Olrik, *Viking Civilization* (New York, 1930), pp. 112 ff. Cf. Karl Lehmann, "Die Rigspula," in *Festschrift . . . Julius von Amsberg* (Rostock, 1904), which develops the thesis that the poem was a product of the feudal age. But what evidence does Lehmann present that would not likewise hold good for *Beowulf* or the dooms of Aethelberht? It is rather surprising that so excellent a book as *Social Scandinavia in the Viking Age*, by Mary W. Williams (New York, 1920), takes no account of the problem here considered.

<sup>50</sup> P. 426; cf. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVI, 799–800, and XLVIII, 250, n. 22. Dopsch (I, chap. 11), after poooh-pooohing the whole theory of the *Markgenossenschaft* and emphasizing the dominant position of the nobility in ancient Germany, could still hold, for some mysterious reason, that the typical German warrior tilled his own land. Cf. his remarks in W. Reeb's edition of the *Germania* (Leipzig, 1930), pp. 157–58.

<sup>51</sup> *Camb. Econ. Hist.*, I, 261 ff.; cf. R. Koebner's remarks, pp. 14 ff.



a chieftain surrounded by professional fighters, how can we suppose that German society was originally an agrarian democracy? Tacitus, for a historian whose main interest was by no means economic, gives us very satisfactory information: the *principes*, together of course with their *comites*, were supported by customary offerings of livestock and produce from their dependents. Whether these dependents were theoretically free or unfree—*servi* who resembled the *coloni* of the Roman Empire—is beside the point. They were assuredly peasants.

To one familiar with the early medieval sources of England those of the Continent should not appear entirely strange. Among the latter, as among the former, we can distinguish three principal groups: historical narratives, charters, and laws. What has each of the three to tell us about the common man on the Continent? And how, if at all, does their testimony disagree with that of the Anglo-Saxon records and other literature, supplemented by the oldest of the Norse sagas? In such an inquiry the burden of proof would seem to be with the scholars who try to demonstrate the existence of the *Markgenossenschaft*, or of its typical member, the warrior-peasant. For they can find no stronger support in the science of the modern anthropologist than in the sources referred to above. Thus the interested student gains considerable respite of labor; he may be sure that every available scrap of evidence in any of the Continental sources, to which no significant addition is likely to appear, has long since been discovered and repeatedly discussed.

So far as historical narratives of the Frankish kingdom and its neighbors are concerned, no one has ever been able to find in them any encouragement for the belief that the average German warrior was also a peasant, or that he somehow helped to constitute a free village community. A glance through the pages of Gregory of Tours and the subsequent writers will surely convince the reader that nothing could be farther from their view of contemporary society than a form of democracy.<sup>52</sup> Nor has the enormous mass of charters afforded much comfort to the believers in the *Markgenossenschaft*. On the contrary, as Wittich pointed out,<sup>53</sup> a single land grant that does not imply the existence of peasant cultivators, regularly bought and sold along with the estate, can hardly be adduced. There remains, accordingly, the evidence of the laws—the legal enactments of the barbarian kings, which correspond to the Anglo-Saxon dooms.

Even if I had the competence, the present essay would lack the space for a thorough analysis of the Continental *leges barbarorum*. Fortunately, with

<sup>52</sup> See Dopsch, II, 128 ff.

<sup>53</sup> See above, n. 23.

the help of Brunner,<sup>54</sup> it is not hard to run through them all, to gain an impression of their general character, and to examine more closely such particular articles as have been commonly cited by the upholders of the traditional doctrine. This, at least, I have done and, in the light of the foregoing discussion, have arrived at a few conclusions. They may be stated rather simply. And since the reader may not have both Brunner and Liebermann at his elbow, I insert a brief memorandum as to the relative age of the sources with which we are here concerned. The Kentish dooms, like those of the West Saxon Ine, date from the seventh century. Alfred's great doombook was written towards the end of the ninth century—to be supplemented, in almost unbroken series, by his successors during the tenth and the early eleventh centuries. Of the Continental *leges* those promulgated by kings of the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Burgundians, Salian Franks, and Lombards are contemporary with, if not older than, the earliest dooms of the Anglo-Saxons. On the other hand, we owe chiefly to the Carolingians of the eighth and ninth centuries our extant summaries of customary law among the Ripuarian Franks, Alamans, Bavarians, Saxons, Frisians, and Thuringians.

Our preliminary question is whether these legal compilations of the Continent ever depict other than an aristocratic society. A rather curious answer is generally given by historians of the Germanist school, led by the distinguished Brunner.<sup>55</sup> The codes of the Ostrogothic, Visigothic, and Burgundian kings, we are told, naturally reflect the late Roman caste system, into which the warriors of those three nations had been drawn through settlement in the imperial provinces. Strangely enough, however, the Lombards, who entered the Italian scene a hundred years later, likewise maintained vigorous class distinctions—and the Lombard law, according to Brunner, shows remarkable affinity with the Anglo-Saxon.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, the *leges* of the Continental Saxons, Frisians, Thuringians, Alamans, and Bavarians all present a more or less complex differentiation of grades among *liberi* or *ingenuiles*. So Brunner has to conclude that the Frankish kingdom was peculiar in fully recognizing the social dominance of the *Gemeinfreien*. Although a *Geburtsadel* had presumably existed among the Franks, as among other Germanic peoples, it was suppressed in Gaul by the all-powerful house of Clovis, while the degenerate

<sup>54</sup> *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, I, 376 ff., to which the reader is referred for bibliographical data concerning the *leges* cited below.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 339 ff. Cf. the article of Köttschke (above, n. 21), whose conclusions were largely accepted by Brunner. In spite of all that has been written on the wergeld system throughout the barbarian kingdoms of Britain and the Continent, its social significance remains very obscure. The problem surely deserves more thorough treatment than it has yet received, but I fear our extant sources are so fragmentary that a final solution may never be possible.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 536.

social structure of Rome was being swept away by the tide of Frankish conquest.<sup>57</sup> Such distinctions of rank as are suggested by Merovingian chroniclers resulted from the growth of inequality in landholding, which also contributed to the rise of a new Carolingian nobility. But the latter was essentially a *Dienstadel*, an aristocracy of service based on royal favor and never closed to recruitment from below.

Brunner's exposition of Frankish society, I agree with Dopsch,<sup>58</sup> is entirely too imaginative. If, in fact, the democratic principles of liberty and equality were unknown to the Germany of Tacitus, to the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, to early Scandinavia, and to most of the other Germanic states, why must we strain a point to find a purer system among the Merovingian Franks? All else we know about them would hardly lead us to select them as paragons! Actually, Brunner's argument rests on little more than the absence in the *Lex Salica*<sup>59</sup> of any comprehensive scale of wergelds—an absence that should more probably be attributed to the vagary of a compiler than to a striving for Germanic democracy. As I have tried to show in a previous article,<sup>60</sup> the growth of feudal institutions in the Carolingian Empire seems to have presupposed the existence there of a warrior aristocracy—such as is portrayed, if I am not mistaken, both by Tacitus and by the whole of Anglo-Saxon literature.

We are thus brought to the more specific question whether the Continental *leges* tend to prove that the typical German warrior was also a peasant. In his noteworthy attack on the established theory Wittich, as we have seen, developed the argument that by *liber* or *ingenuus* the official compilations really designated a sort of *Grundherr*, a small proprietor whose land was worked for him by *Knechten*.<sup>61</sup> To declare Wittich's thesis exploded, the orthodox then had only to quote a number of texts that referred to plowing and other agricultural labor on the part of freemen. Such texts fall into two principal groups: those prohibiting to free and unfree all servile work (*opera servilia*) on Sunday<sup>62</sup> and those establishing penalties for men, presumably

<sup>57</sup> "In diese kastenartig abgeschlossene und versteinerte Gesellschaft mit ausgeklügelten Titularen und pedantischen Kleiderordnungen hat die germanische Invasion Luft und Bewegung gebracht. Die fränkische Rechtsordnung ignorierte das römische Ständewesen." *Ibid.*, I, 340.

<sup>58</sup> II, 96 ff. But in the following discussion, as before, Dopsch insists that German warriors regularly engaged in agricultural labor. Why in this respect he should support Brunner, Kötzschke, *et al.* I do not understand; for the evidence he presents is no better than theirs.

<sup>59</sup> The *Lex Ribuariorum*, he points out (*Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, I, 444), was modeled on the *Lex Salica*.

<sup>60</sup> *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVI, 788 ff.

<sup>61</sup> See above, p. 426.

<sup>62</sup> *Leges Alamannorum*, xxxviii; *Lex Baiwariorum*, vii, 4, which explains such *opera* to be the yoking of oxen, sowing, haying, etc. It should be noted that Brunner, Kötzschke, and other historians of the orthodox school pass over in silence the fact that agricultural labor is here described as servile.

free, who plowed or otherwise injured the crops sown by another.<sup>63</sup> But to one who has studied the Anglo-Saxon dooms this comes as an anticlimax. The seventh century kings of Kent and Wessex, in obedience to the church, likewise ordained that any man, free or unfree, who, with or without his lord's command, worked on Sunday should be severely punished.<sup>64</sup> And that the Kentish or West Saxon *ceorl* was a free peasant, protected by a two-hundred-shilling wergeld, is indisputable.<sup>65</sup> Must we therefore suppose that he was a true warrior and the member of a *Markgenossenschaft*?

For reasons stated above, the English evidence would seem to prove the contrary, and the inferior sources of the Continent do not lead to a different conclusion. We may surely admit that throughout western Europe some, perhaps most, peasants were legally free without regarding them as warrior-citizens of a national state. Before making any such deduction from the scanty records at our disposal, we should remember at least these facts. Under established law the Roman *colonus*, no less than the ordinary German peasant, was protected by a freeman's wergeld.<sup>66</sup> Besides, any such peasant could be bound to a lord by the hereditary tie of commendation, which apparently involved seignorial control of whatever land he might possess. Until the subject of commendation on the Continent has been more thoroughly investigated, we cannot be sure of its precise implications. But even a cursory examination of the pertinent records tends to convince us that what Latin writers called *commendatio* was no mere survival from decadent Rome. Both the Anglo-Saxon dooms and the Continental *leges* reveal it as a significant element of Germanic custom—one that vitally affected the life of the masses in early medieval Europe. Too many writers continue to describe commendation as essentially the equivalent of vassalage; by doing so, in my opinion, they badly confuse the issue. The great majority of *commendati* were obviously peasants, and on that very account could not be vassals.<sup>67</sup>

There remains, finally, the question whether the forty-fifth title of the *Lex Salica* truly refers, as most historians have agreed, to the *Markgenos-*

<sup>63</sup> The oldest of such provisions is that of the *Lex Salica*, xxvii, 23: "If anyone plows the field of another without the consent of his lord (*extra consilium domini sui*), he shall be adjudged guilty [and liable to a fine of 15s.]." I cannot see why Kötzschke or anybody else should think that the *dominus* here mentioned was the owner of the land in question. Cf. the Anglo-Saxon dooms cited in the following note. The *Lex Ribuaria*, the *Lex Alamannorum*, and the *Lex Frisionum* merely follow the *Lex Salica*. Brunner (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Germanistische Abteilung, XIX, 106) offers as additional evidence in this connection what the *Rigspula* (above, p. 431) says about the *karl*.

<sup>64</sup> Wihtraed, 10-11; Inc, 3; Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, 13, 91.

<sup>65</sup> For numerous references to the dooms see *ibid.*, II, 299 ("Bauer," 7).

<sup>66</sup> Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, I, 352.

<sup>67</sup> Many recent discussions of this complex problem, as well as some of the pertinent sources, are cited in my previous articles: *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVI, 788 ff., and XLVIII, 245 ff.; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LIX, 289 ff.

*senschaft*.<sup>68</sup> Without stopping to comment on the lengthy discussion evoked by this famous enactment, let us see what it attempts to say. "If anyone wishes to move into a villa upon the land of another (*super alterum in villa migrare*), and one or several of those living there wish to receive him but there is one who objects, he who wishes to move there shall not have license to do so."<sup>69</sup> If, contrary to this prohibition, such a man refuses to leave, he must do so within thirty days or incur a judicial penalty of 30s. Should, however, no opposition arise within twelve months, he may stay there *sicut alii vicini*. That the license mentioned above might involve royal action is clearly stated by the fourteenth title, which provides that any man who wishes to move (*migrare*), and has the king's authorization (*praeceptum*), is not to be interfered with under heavy penalty (200s.). Is the *migrans* of these laws to be understood as a free peasant who can be prevented from joining a village community by the veto of a single *Markgenosse*?

Rather, I take it, the *migrans* was a person of importance—a Frankish gentleman who, according to the prevalent fashion, was transferring his domicile from the northeast to the southwest and who wanted to settle upon certain Roman property. Without a royal precept, he must not do so if one or two of the neighbors took exception to his presence. Otherwise, we may presume, the peace of the countryside would be unduly disturbed. There is nothing in our text to suggest that we have to do with other than a man of superior rank, who might be bringing with him any number of his own retainers and who might well be interested in a portion of a Roman villa, including of course the appurtenant buildings, tools, livestock, slaves, and *coloni*. Can we for a moment suppose that a king like Clovis would issue letters of protection for a simple plowman, however free, and assess a fine of 200s. upon anybody who molested him? To discover proof of the *Markgenossenschaft* in such meager articles of the *Lex Salica*, one must indeed have profound faith in primitive German democracy. And the rest of the Continental *leges* have been searched in vain for equally good evidence!

Our brief review of the sources thus leads us to conclude that in early medieval Europe the common man was at most a simple peasant. Though recognized as free, in that his body was not owned, he would normally be the humble follower of a lord—a tribal chieftain, a successful conqueror, a prelate of the church, or some other gentleman. To this lord the peasant, and

<sup>68</sup> For the traditional view see Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, I, 281; for opposing views Dopsch, I, 226, 354, 371, and R. Koebner, *Camb. Econ. Hist.*, I, 34.

<sup>69</sup> This is my own translation, made to express what seems to me the obvious meaning of the text; but it is essentially the same as that of Fustel de Coulanges, *Nouvelles recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire*, ed. Jullian (Paris, 1891), pp. 343 ff.



his children after him, would very likely be bound by a personal tie that involved the performance of customary service. The latter would be agricultural rather than military—and so, according to the standard of the day, servile rather than honorable. The lord, as a member of the warlike aristocracy, would scorn all manual labor; like his ancestors, whether barbarian or Roman, he would gain his regular sustenance from economic dependents. The peasant would be expected to spend his life working the soil, either that of the lord or a plot to which he himself had some kind of hereditary title. In time of need his lord, or perhaps the king, might indeed call upon him for military duty of a sort. As a warrior, however, he would be considered quite inferior to the gentleman who made fighting a profession. In other words, we should not imagine the Germanic state of the early Middle Ages to have been essentially a national union formed by a citizen soldiery of free peasants.

Why do most historians still cling to the myth of the *Markgenossenschaft*? Why will they not recognize that, by gaining some measure of economic liberty, of social equality, and of political power, the common man has not returned to the sentimental primitive but has achieved the new and revolutionary? I shall be happy if this article has helped to advance that better understanding of history. Yet, in spite of the evidence, I fear that many will keep their devotion to the great romantic tradition. To them I merely suggest that they acknowledge their faith and pin up as an icon Möser's picture of the original *Markgenosse*.

# The One-Party Period of American History

CHARLES S. SYDNOR\*

MONROE'S presidency has been called an Era of Good Feeling; on the other hand it has been regarded as a turbulent period when sectional rivalry was destroying national unity. Each of these conflicting interpretations may be defended if one defines politics to suit his argument. If politics means little more than elections and the activities of organized political groups, this period was indeed one of the least eventful in the history of the nation; but if the scope of politics is extended beyond these narrow limits to include major contests over public lands, protective tariff, internal improvements, and the admission of Missouri, and to include the temper in which these issues were debated and the influence that these issues were to have on party history in future years, then Monroe's administration must be regarded as a period of intense and portentous political activity. Naturally enough, historical attention has been drawn chiefly to this larger and more active political area.

This paper, however, turns to the narrower field of party history. True enough, there are few events therein to chronicle except the placid elections of Monroe in 1816 and 1820 and the complex struggle of 1824; but to compensate for paucity of events these years contain three political phenomena that are unusual if not unique in American history. In Monroe's presidency the most complete one-party situation in the history of the nation occurred; the first device for nominating presidential candidates reached the peak of its development; and popular participation in presidential elections declined to an extremely low point—probably to the lowest in all American history. It is the purpose of this paper to review these occurrences, to offer brief descriptions of their less familiar features, and to suggest a shift in emphasis in their interpretation. The political prominence of Virginia in this era when the Virginia dynasty was in power must give to this state the central position in the discussion.

The single-party situation arose when the Federalist organization disintegrated after the War of 1812. In the election of 1816 it made no formal nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates, and it put forth

\*The author is professor of history in Duke University. Research for this paper was made possible by a grant from the Social Science Research Council.

electoral tickets in only three states. Four years later it took no part in the election, and only in Pennsylvania and Connecticut were opposing electoral tickets placed before the people.<sup>1</sup> With the decline of the Federalists the Republican party acquired a political monopoly in the elections of 1816 and 1820 that was far more absolute than any other national party has ever possessed. The only comparable situation must be sought in state rather than in national politics, and it is perhaps best illustrated in the dominance of the Democratic party in some of the southern states since the Reconstruction period.

The nomination of candidates by legislative caucuses was another of the unusual political phenomena of this era. The most familiar feature of the system was the congressional caucus which both parties began to use near the beginning of the century for the selection of their presidential candidates. The Federalists, however, held no nominating caucus after the War of 1812, and thereafter the Republican caucus, which most of the members of Congress were entitled to attend, in effect chose the chief executive of the United States. But in actual practice, not many congressmen attended these later party meetings. A heavy rain on the evening set for the 1820 caucus, together with growing hostility to the system, reduced attendance to such a point that it seemed unwise to make a nomination. Monroe was accepted as the party's nominee for a second term without the formality of a congressional caucus nomination, though he was regarded as the caucus candidate.<sup>2</sup> Four years later there was a caucus which nominated William H. Crawford for the presidency, but the institution was then in such disfavor that only 66 members of Congress attended (two others voted by proxy) out of a total membership of 261.<sup>3</sup>

But the congressional party meeting was only the capstone of the caucus system. "The formidable central power," as Rufus King of New York called it, reached and was "systematically combined with affiliated bodies at the seats of government of the great states."<sup>4</sup> The state legislative caucuses, to which King was referring, had been in use for many years. As early as the election of 1800, ninety-three members of the Virginia legislature and "other respectable persons" met to frame a ticket of Republican electors and to take other

<sup>1</sup> *National Intelligencer*, Nov. 7, 15, 30, 1820, and ff.; Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency from 1788 to 1897* (Boston, 1928), I, 111, 118; *New Haven Columbian Register*, Dec. 2, 1820.

<sup>2</sup> *National Intelligencer*, Apr. 5, 8, 10, 1820; *Richmond Enquirer*, Apr. 14, Nov. 7, 1820; William O. Lynch, *Fifty Years of Party Warfare* (Indianapolis, 1931), p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> *Niles' Register*, Feb. 21, 28, 1824; *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 16, 1824.

<sup>4</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Congress, 1 session, pp. 358, 361.

measures for the success of their party.<sup>5</sup> During the campaign of 1812, legislative caucuses were held in Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia.<sup>6</sup> Other state caucuses were held in 1816 and 1820,<sup>7</sup> and during the campaign of 1824 they were held in most of the states. Virginia, Georgia, New York, and North Carolina nominated William H. Crawford; Kentucky, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, and Louisiana supported Henry Clay; South Carolina put forth William Lowndes and, after his death, held a second caucus to nominate John C. Calhoun; most of the New England states recommended John Quincy Adams; and the Tennessee house of representatives nominated Andrew Jackson.<sup>8</sup>

Nor did these legislative caucuses mark the outer limits of the system. In Virginia its tentacles reached all the way down to the counties. On the evening of February 17, 1820, eight days before the adjournment of the state legislature, the Republican members met in the state capitol. More than three fourths of the members of each house were present, and visitors crowded the lobby and gallery.<sup>9</sup> The caucus selected a ticket of twenty-five electoral candidates—the number to which the state of Virginia was entitled—and a ten-member central corresponding committee. The following evening the caucus met again and appointed committees of five or six members to carry on the work in each county and borough in the state. There were nearly six hundred of these local committeemen, and more than half of them were members of the county courts, the governing bodies of the counties.<sup>10</sup> There was nothing new about this elaborate machinery in Virginia. It had been used by the

<sup>5</sup> Manuscript pamphlet entitled "Proceedings of a meeting held at the Capitol in the City of Richmond for the purpose of framing a Republican Ticket, 1800, Jany. 21st," in the Virginia State Library. It has been printed in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, IX, 74-87. I am indebted to Mr. William J. Van Schreeven, head archivist in this library, for bringing the document to my attention.

<sup>6</sup> Stanwood, I, 90; John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War* (8 vols., New York, 1883-1913), IV, 191-92.

<sup>7</sup> For example, New York and Pennsylvania in 1816 (McMaster, IV, 363); Virginia, North Carolina, and New Hampshire in 1820 (Richmond *Enquirer*, Feb. 19, 22, 1820; Albert Ray Newsome, *The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina* [Chapel Hill, 1939], p. 40, n. 142, pp. 73-75; Amherst *Farmers' Cabinet*, June 24, 1820).

<sup>8</sup> *Niles' Register*, Aug. 24, 1822; Feb. 28, 1824; Richmond *Enquirer*, Feb. 24, 26, 28, 1824; Stanwood, I, 126-27; McMaster, V, 60-63; Newsome, pp. 53, 73-75; Providence *Rhode Island American*, June 8, 1824; Portsmouth *New Hampshire Gazette*, June 15, 1824; Hartford *Connecticut Courant*, May 25, 1824. While the New York caucus of April 22, 1823, did not nominate Crawford by name, it did so in effect when it resolved that Congress should hold a caucus; for it was generally believed that if a congressional caucus made a nomination, its approval would be given to Crawford. Jabez D. Hammond, *The History of Political Parties in the State of New York* (Syracuse, 1852), II, 128-29.

<sup>9</sup> An account of the meeting of the caucus is in the Richmond *Enquirer*, Feb. 19, 22, 1820. For the roll of this legislature see *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Library Board of the Virginia State Library, 1915-1916* (Richmond, 1917), pp. 100-103.

<sup>10</sup> The list of committeemen in the Richmond *Enquirer*, Feb. 22, 1820, was compared with the county court rolls in the manuscript "Register of Justices and County Officers, 1780-1822," in the Virginia State Library.

caucus of 1800, and it was used as late as the campaign of 1824.<sup>11</sup> The great potential influence of this creation of Virginia politicians will be evident if one will recall the power of the county courts in local government and in the management of popular elections.

The Rhode Island state Republican caucus likewise made use of local committees "to attend at the polls and keep the meeting[s] open,"<sup>12</sup> and there are hints that town and county committees were appointed by the caucuses of some other states. In view of the occasional use of these local committees and the general practice of holding state caucuses, it becomes evident that the caucus system was much more than a quadrennial meeting of party members in Congress.

The third of the unique political phenomena of the Era of Good Feeling was the smallness of the popular vote in presidential elections. In Baltimore, a city of 62,738 inhabitants, only 568 votes were cast in the election of 1820;<sup>13</sup> in Richmond 17 persons voted (12,067 inhabitants);<sup>14</sup> in Providence, Rhode Island, 81 votes were polled (11,767 inhabitants), and in Newport 52 votes (7,319 inhabitants).<sup>15</sup> In all of Virginia, where there were more than 600,000 white persons, only 4,321 votes were cast for presidential electors;<sup>16</sup> the Connecticut vote was a little more than 4,000;<sup>17</sup> the New Hampshire vote was 9,444;<sup>18</sup> the Pennsylvania vote was 32,206;<sup>19</sup> it was 724 in Rhode Island;<sup>20</sup> in Kentucky it was probably less than 8,000;<sup>21</sup> in Mississippi it was only 751;<sup>22</sup> and in North Carolina, 3,567 votes were cast in 53 of the 62 counties.<sup>23</sup> Less than two per cent of the white population of these eight states

<sup>11</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 24, 26, 28, 1824.

<sup>12</sup> *Providence Gazette*, Nov. 20, 1820; *Providence Rhode Island American*, June 8, 1824. The Harrisburg Convention of 1824 set up a state corresponding committee and local committees of from three to nine members in each county of Pennsylvania. *Harrisburg Pennsylvania Intelligencer*, Mar. 11, 1824.

<sup>13</sup> *Niles' Register*, Dec. 9, 1820. The number of inhabitants of this and the following cities is from the *United States Census for 1820* (Washington, 1821).

<sup>14</sup> The original 1820 returns from each of the Virginia counties and boroughs, together with a manuscript tabulation entitled "Votes given for Electors to choose a President and Vice President of the United States," are in the Virginia State Library.

<sup>15</sup> *Providence Gazette*, Nov. 20, 1820.

<sup>16</sup> See note 14 above.

<sup>17</sup> *New Haven Columbian Register*, Dec. 2, 9, 1820.

<sup>18</sup> *Amherst Farmers' Cabinet*, Dec. 2, 1820.

<sup>19</sup> Brown Focht, ed., *Pennsylvania Manual* (1941), pp. 141-42. The original returns were probably destroyed by the fire in the old capitol, and a search in six contemporary Pennsylvania newspapers revealed the vote only in Philadelphia.

<sup>20</sup> *Providence Gazette*, Nov. 27, 1820.

<sup>21</sup> Frankfort (Ky.) *Argus of Western America*, Nov. 30, 1820, for the vote in the second district (3,257), and the Lexington *Western Monitor*, Nov. 28, 1820, for the vote in the third district (2,556). The vote in the first district has not been found, but in the election of 1824 it was smaller than in either of the others.

<sup>22</sup> Manuscript entitled "Election Returns for Electors of P. & V. P. of U. S." filed in Series F, Number 27, in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

<sup>23</sup> Newsome, p. 156.



participated in this election.<sup>24</sup> This light vote cannot be accounted for by high suffrage restrictions, for in contemporary gubernatorial or congressional contests in Mississippi, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire nearly thirteen per cent of the white population voted.<sup>25</sup> Obviously, only a small fraction of those who were entitled to vote chose to participate in the presidential election of 1820.

Here then were three unusual occurrences that existed together and then disappeared almost simultaneously. It is natural to suppose that they bore some relationship to each other. The main question is whether the one-party situation or the caucus system of making nominations was responsible for the unhealthy state of democracy that was indicated by the absence of most of the voters from the polls.

Most of the commentators of that day regarded the caucus as being at the root of the trouble. To quote but a few of the strictures, Hezekiah Niles said that the American people had no need for "that dirty thing which is called a *caucus* . . . they are able to judge for themselves; they do not want a master to direct them how they shall vote!"<sup>26</sup> A Maryland newspaper branded it as "a *stragem* of a few to *coerce* and *control* the *many*."<sup>27</sup> Others asserted that "the advocates of a caucus have but one end in view, and that is, to cause someone to be elected who might not be without it."<sup>28</sup> Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina objected to its undemocratic character, and, furthermore, regarded it as extraconstitutional if not indeed unconstitutional.<sup>29</sup> In New York it was charged in language borrowed from the Declaration of Independence that "King Caucus . . . has refused his assent to laws the most

<sup>24</sup> A complete tabulation of the popular vote in the election of 1820 is probably unattainable. Contemporary lack of interest in the returns is indicated by the fact that neither the *National Intelligencer* nor *Niles' Register* published the popular vote of any state. In only nine states (New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, Mississippi) were general tickets of electors chosen by popular vote. In an equal number they were chosen by the legislature (Vermont, New York, Delaware, South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Indiana, Alabama, Missouri). In the remaining six states (Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois) choice was with the people, but inasmuch as these states used the district system the total vote is difficult to find.

<sup>25</sup> In Mississippi 6,199 votes were cast for governor in 1821 (manuscript "General Election Returns for 1821" in Series F, Number 27, Mississippi Department of Archives and History). In the previous year 62,526 votes were counted in Kentucky (*Nashville Whig*, Sept. 5, 1820), 134,226 in Pennsylvania (*Harrisburg Chronicle*, Dec. 21, 1820), and 24,771 in New Hampshire (*Amherst Farmers' Cabinet*, June 10, 1820) in gubernatorial elections; and 5,744 were cast in a congressional election in Rhode Island (*Providence Rhode-Island American, and General Advertiser*, Nov. 7, 1820).

<sup>26</sup> *Niles' Register*, Jan. 26, 1822.

<sup>27</sup> *Easton Gazette*, quoted in *Annapolis Maryland Gazette*, Oct. 2, 1823.

<sup>28</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Jan. 1, 1824.

<sup>29</sup> Newsome, p. 81, n. 79. This careful study contains a number of other North Carolina objections to caucus nominations.

wholesome and necessary for the public good.”<sup>30</sup> “Aristides” of Maryland declared that whereas “Democracy did once mean, a popular form of government; that is, a government originating with, and controlled and protected by, the people,” it had now come to be a “form of government originating with the few; in which the people have no share, in which they have no voice, no power, no rights.”<sup>31</sup>

One of the most frequently reiterated of the charges against the congressional caucus was the assertion that the men who composed it had assumed power that properly belonged to all the voters. To this indictment the defenders of the caucus made answer that democracy could not operate without nominating machinery—without some kind of device “by which public opinion may be consulted and united.”<sup>32</sup> As Samuel Smith of Maryland said in the course of a debate in the Senate of the United States, “In a government like ours, where many of our great officers are elected, there must be some mode adopted to concentrate the votes of the people.”<sup>33</sup>

In the second place, it was often charged, either plainly or by implication, that the caucus was not democratic because it was not responsive and accountable to the opinion of the voters.<sup>34</sup> This charge was met in part by suggesting that no other nominating machinery had yet been created that was any more representative of public opinion; certainly, so it was said, the nominating conventions of the day were as open to criticism as the caucus. Fifteen days after the Harrisburg Convention had met in Pennsylvania on March 5, 1824, the charge was made in the United States Senate—and the charge went unchallenged—that delegates were chosen in this wise: “A few people meet; their numbers may be ten, fifty, or any other number, and they appoint the delegates; and, thus chosen, they meet in convention, and select their candidates.”<sup>35</sup> Critics of the New York Convention which met at Utica in Septem-

<sup>30</sup> Quoted in Dixon Ryan Fox, *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York* (New York, 1919), p. 296. For other evidences of New York hostility to the caucus see C. H. Rammelkamp, “The Campaign of 1824 in New York,” American Historical Association, *Annual Report for 1904* (Washington, 1905), pp. 177–201.

<sup>31</sup> *Maryland Gazette*, Mar. 25, 1819. For other strictures on the caucus see issues for Oct. 9, 1823, and Oct. 7, 1824.

<sup>32</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Jan. 3, 1824.

<sup>33</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Cong., 1 sess., p. 398.

<sup>34</sup> A third objection to the caucus was expressed at a later date by M. Ostrogorski, one of the earliest and most influential students of this period of American history. He disliked it because he had a deep-seated aversion to everything that contributed to party discipline and regularity; whether the caucus was a good or bad instrument for a party to use was of little concern to him. Most subsequent students have not shared Ostrogorski’s hostility to party government, but some of them seem to have absorbed his aversion to caucus nominations. M. Ostrogorski, “The Rise and Fall of the Nominating Caucus, Legislative and Congressional,” *American Historical Review*, V (1899), 253–83; *id.*, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties* (New York, 1902), especially II, 1–79.

<sup>35</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Cong., 1 sess., p. 399.

ber, 1824, derided it because its members had been selected in tiny local meetings.<sup>86</sup>

There is ample reason for discounting most of the contemporary criticism because of the circumstances under which it was uttered. In the campaign of 1824, when this criticism reached flood tide, the congressional caucus was expected to nominate Crawford. The other candidates and their supporters therefore needed to destroy this machine which was working in Crawford's interest.<sup>87</sup> Although some of the critics may have been moved by considerations of principle as well as political necessity, it is highly significant that Adams, Clay, Calhoun, and Jackson seemed to be as willing as Crawford to accept caucus nominations when they could get them. All of them had the blessing of state legislative caucuses. Furthermore, the vigorous resolutions of the Tennessee legislature opposing the holding of a congressional caucus must be interpreted in the light of the fact that this body had earlier nominated Jackson for the presidency.<sup>88</sup> The conclusion seems to be inescapable that men used a caucus when they could; they called it evil when it blocked their path. Samuel Smith of Maryland made a judicious summary of the situation when he stated in the United States Senate in 1824 that the caucus had now

met with the displeasure of several gentlemen with whom I have served in caucus more than once. Well, sir [he continued], they have their reasons, such as are satisfactory to themselves, with which I have nothing to do. That of being conscientiously against it, they cannot offer. There are certainly some who think the system wrong on principle. . . . I have not met with many. May we not, without offense, believe that men are governed by the consideration of whether the caucus will or will not support their favorite candidate? . . . No, sir, there is no principle involved.<sup>89</sup>

In view of the biased character of many of the contemporary anticaucus pronouncements, it would seem that this method of making nominations deserves a more dispassionate and thorough appraisal than it has yet received. Without attempting to exhaust the subject from the standpoint of political theory, a few statements may be ventured about the actual operation of the caucus system in the early 1820's. Essentially, it was an organization through which the political party performed the two functions of making nominations and of working for the election of its ticket. To accomplish the latter

<sup>86</sup> Fox, p. 291.

<sup>87</sup> One of the best views of the scheming of the candidates in this campaign is through Everett S. Brown, "The Presidential Election of 1824-1825," *Political Science Quarterly*, XL (1925), 384-403.

<sup>88</sup> *Niles' Register*, Aug. 24, 1822; Nov. 1, 1823.

<sup>89</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 395-96, 398.

purpose, the congressional caucus and some of the state caucuses created corresponding committees, and, in some states, town and county committees were established. In addition, and perhaps with more effect, individual members of Congress and of the state legislatures sought to influence their constituents by newspaper articles, circular letters, and conversation. Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina, speaking in the United States Senate in 1824, asked, "How are my people to know [the candidates for the presidency]? Why, when I go home, they ask me whom I think to be the best man; or rather, who will tax them the least? which is the same thing. And, I presume, the same questions are put to other members."<sup>40</sup>

Besides this attempt to secure regularity at the polls by downward pressure from party leaders upon the voters, there was also the prior upward pressure which had influenced the leaders in the selection of candidates; for in the caucus system plain men had ways of telling party chiefs what to do, of discovering whether they followed those directions, and of punishing them if they did not.

In laying their wishes before their representatives, the voters could employ the usual channels of private communication as well as the press and resolutions of public meetings. But public opinion was focused upon the caucus chiefly by reason of the fact that the system was embedded in that branch of government which was closest to the people and was most subject to their immediate control. In a number of states the only officeholders who were popularly elected were the members of the legislature, and legislators were kept in close touch with their constituents by the shortness of their terms of office, which ran in most instances only for one year, and by the force of public opinion, which in that day regarded the legislative branch of government as the direct representative of the people. Thus the voters frequently found their representatives in a mood to listen and promise (according to the nature of politicians at the moment of candidacy); and if the voters were interested in the presidential succession, they could vote for the candidate who would make acceptable promises.<sup>41</sup>

Public opinion could tug and pull at the members of the congressional caucus in similar fashion. In addition, state caucuses could seek to influence the congressional caucus by nominating their favorite candidates several months or even years before the national meeting.<sup>42</sup> These state recom-

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 400-401.

<sup>41</sup> Newsome, pp. 54-61, illustrates this procedure.

<sup>42</sup> See references in notes 6, 7, and 8. The statement made above in the text suggests that the state caucus would have to decide between meeting first with the hope of influencing the congressional decision or meeting afterward with the aim of enforcing that decision. While

mendations had to be regarded as something more than reasonably accurate polls of political opinion, for the legislatures spoke with authority based on real power as well as prestige. The caucus opinions of Vermont, New York, Delaware, South Carolina, Georgia, or Louisiana carried especially great weight in 1824 from the fact that in these states presidential electors were chosen by the legislatures rather than by the people. Furthermore, legislatures customarily expressed opinions on national issues and occasionally advised representatives in Congress how to vote. To senators, who had been elected by the legislatures and who in theory represented the states rather than the people, the legislatures sometimes gave directions about voting that amounted to orders.

In short, the voter could state his views on presidential candidates directly to his congressman, or, by a longer route, his views could be sent upward through his representative in the legislature to the legislative caucus, and thence to the congressional caucus. In any event, participants in congressional caucuses could not plead ignorance of public opinion.

Just as the caucus members had means of knowing what their constituents wanted, so the constituents could know what went on in the caucuses. As early as 1804 the Republicans threw aside the veil of secrecy by opening their congressional caucus to public observation. Advance notice of such meetings began to appear in the press. Twenty years later the members of the congressional caucus could tell something about popular reaction by comments, applause, and hisses from the gallery.<sup>43</sup> The doors were likewise open when some of the state caucuses met, and newspaper reports occasionally made it possible to tell how each member voted.<sup>44</sup>

Since the caucus member usually knew what his constituents wanted, and since the constituents were not kept in total ignorance of whether he acted accordingly, it was possible to punish departures from the path of pre-election promises by that penalty which to many officeholders is the most grievous.<sup>45</sup> In the states where presidential electors were chosen by the legislature the

---

there is a measure of truth in such reasoning, it must be remembered that the views of some states were too well known to need caucus formulation. The congressional caucus of 1824 could be certain that Virginia favored Crawford even though the Virginia legislative caucus had not yet met. Furthermore, the Republican members of a legislature could meet more than once during a campaign. Those of New York took action on the presidential question both before and after the meeting of the 1824 congressional caucus. Rammelkamp, in A.H.A., *Annual Report for 1904*, pp. 177-201.

<sup>43</sup> *Niles' Register*, Feb. 28, 1824.

<sup>44</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 19, 22, 1820; Feb. 24, 26, 1824; Newsome, pp. 73-75.

<sup>45</sup> For examples of the "breaking" of congressmen and legislators who voted contrary to the wishes of their constituents see Newsome, pp. 172-73, and Rammelkamp, in A.H.A., *Annual Report for 1904*, p. 198.

constituents might not have to wait until it was too late to punish their representatives. If a legislative election intervened between the caucus and the presidential election, the people could replace representatives who had voted contrary to public opinion.

It seems fair to conclude that the caucus system served the useful party function of getting nominations made, and that it afforded channels through which the rank and file of party members could transmit their opinions upward to the assemblage that made the ultimate choice between candidates. Obviously, the system contained some defects, and it never reached full development; nevertheless, its imperfections do not seem to have been grave enough to explain the lightness of the vote in presidential elections or the unresponsiveness of party leaders to the opinions which the voters expressed.

Inasmuch as the caucus does not afford a sufficient explanation of current democratic evils, it is necessary to probe the other unusual political occurrence of the times, namely, the one-party situation into which the nation had drifted. Suppose this situation be viewed from the standpoint of a voter in the election of 1820: He knew that if he went to the polls he would (except in Connecticut and Pennsylvania) find a single ticket of presidential electors pledged to vote for Monroe and Tompkins.<sup>46</sup> If he liked this ticket, he could vote for it; but it was unnecessary. A handful of votes would be enough to elect it. If he disliked Monroe, he could not use his vote in protest; for there was no other candidate or opposing electoral ticket. Under these circumstances, most Americans decided that their daily tasks were more important than voting in an election which offered no issues; therefore, as was noted earlier, the popular vote in the election of 1820 was exceedingly small. Niles, who detested the caucus, nevertheless understood that the light vote was due to the one-party situation. Referring to Maryland and Virginia, he said, "the election of electors excited so little interest, because there was no thought of opposition, that very few votes were given in—only 17 at Richmond!"<sup>47</sup>

Nor was the decline in voting the only evil occasioned by the one-party situation. Those at the top of the political machine could disregard public

<sup>46</sup> In Tennessee, Kentucky, and perhaps elsewhere he could choose between rival electoral candidates, but nothing was at stake except their vanity: all of them were expected to support Monroe and Tompkins. Nashville *Whig*, Sept. 26, Oct. 3, Nov. 15, 1820; Frankfort *Argus of Western America*, Nov. 30, 1820; Lexington *Western Monitor*, Nov. 28, 1820; Lexington *Kentucky Reporter*, Nov. 20, Dec. 4, 1820.

<sup>47</sup> Niles' *Register*, Nov. 18, 1820. The New Haven *Columbian Register*, Dec. 9, 1820, remarked that "unless the minority turns out at an election, the majority will give but a small vote." At the present time apathy hangs over many southern states on the day of state elections, and for the same reason. Only one Democratic candidate is presented for each office on the day of the formal election; hence (unless the Republicans have entered candidates), why vote? The excitement comes earlier when the Democratic primary is being held.



opinion and select nominees without regard to their popularity, because the voters could not protest by voting for the competing ticket. There was none. To force party chiefs to listen to the people there needed to be rival nominations; whether they were made by caucuses, conventions, or otherwise would seem to be unimportant. If a second party had created a system of legislative and congressional caucuses to parallel the Republican caucus system, thus presenting the voters with two sets of nominees, would they not have regained an interest in elections? And if the people had regained the power to choose between rival candidates, would not party leaders have been forced to select candidates with more regard to their popularity?

The proof of this thesis consists in setting facts in their correct chronological sequence. In the presidential elections of 1820 and 1824 there was no modification in nominating procedure, but there was a change from a single candidate in 1820 to multiple candidates in 1824. The popular vote in the election of 1824 showed an increase of 130 per cent over the vote in 1820. In 1828 the voters were again offered a choice of candidates; and again there was an increase of 133 per cent in the popular vote. Then in 1832 a new method of selecting candidates was adopted with the introduction of the national nominating convention; but voting increased in that election only 5 per cent and in 1836 only 23 per cent.<sup>48</sup> It was not a new way of making nominations but the making of multiple nominations that attracted people to the polls.

I am aware, of course, that the panic of 1819, the growth of the West, tension over the admission of Missouri, and controversies over the tariff, internal improvements, and public land policy were the fundamental forces behind the increased interest in national politics; but these forces did not produce a large vote in a presidential election until after the monopoly of the Republican machine was broken. He who doubts should remember that most of these pressures were strong in 1820 when the one-party system was intact, and the vote was then very light.

If the data and the arguments that have been presented are valid, the following conclusions seem to be in order. First, the key to the interpretation

<sup>48</sup> These statements are subject to the following explanations and comments. First, the 1820 popular vote was found for only eight states, and for three of them the record is not complete (see above, notes 16 through 23 and the text which they support). The 1824 increase was calculated on those eight states after making what seemed to be a reasonable allowance for the three incomplete returns. Secondly, the 1828 increase is based on the eighteen states that had popular voting for presidential elections both in 1824 and 1828. The 1828 increase would have appeared much larger if the votes cast in Vermont, New York, Georgia, and Louisiana had been counted; but it seemed unfair to do so, for the electors of these states had not been chosen by popular vote in 1824. For the number of votes cast in the elections of 1824, 1828, 1832, and 1836, I have relied on Stanwood.

of the so-called Era of Good Feeling is the fact that only one party was active in the nation and that the political stagnation of the times can be explained by this situation better than by reference to the method which this party used to make nominations. Secondly, the caucus system was in fact a larger and more elaborate form of party organization than the occasional meetings of the congressional caucuses; and in the appraisal of the caucus little weight should be given to contemporary attacks upon it. Thirdly, the one-party situation must not be overlooked in accounting for the political events of the next few years, particularly for the spread of Jacksonian democracy over the nation.

Jacksonian democracy has usually been regarded as a product of the frontier, but the question of why it appeared in the older and more conservative East has received no adequate answer.<sup>49</sup> It seems reasonable to suppose that any valid explanation ought to take into consideration the previous political situation. In summary fashion let us begin at that point and outline the developments of the next few years. The first occurrence was the destruction of the monopolistic power of the Republican party's machine in 1824, and it is a matter of great importance that this was accomplished by internal disintegration<sup>50</sup> rather than by the creation of a rival party; for thereby the one-party era was not followed by a biparty period but by a period of party anarchy which continued without much abatement until national nominating conventions made their appearance in 1832. True enough, most Americans claimed to be Republicans in the elections of 1824 and 1828, but neither the party as a whole nor any of its warring factions had a national organization.

This transition from a state of party organization to a state of party chaos profoundly affected the quality of candidates, the power and behavior of the voters, and the customs of campaigning. When there was but one party under the firm management of experienced politicians, candidates were chosen on the basis of party regularity and of acceptableness to the gray-beards of the organization. When there was but one ticket offered on election day, voters could not have much influence no matter how good or how bad was the machinery that had chosen that ticket; consequently, they re-

<sup>49</sup> An important contribution to the answer can be found in chapter iv of Russel B. Nye, *George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel* (New York, 1944). Since this article was accepted for publication the volume by Arthur M. Schlesinger, jr., *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1945), has fully developed this theme.

<sup>50</sup> Long before the event William H. Crawford had made the prophetic observation that "the great depression of the Federal party . . . cannot fail to relax the bonds by which the Republican party has been hitherto kept together." Crawford to Albert Gallatin, Washington, Mar. 12, 1817, in *Writings of Gallatin*, ed. by Henry Adams (Philadelphia, 1879), II, 27.

mained away from the polls, lost political experience, and became apathetic. When there were no rival candidates or competing parties, campaigns were dull and elections were cut and dried affairs. But with the dissolution of the organization of the Republican party, competing candidates were nominated by legislative caucuses, local conventions, newspaper editors, self-appointed committees, and in a variety of other ways. Candidates for humbler offices did not hesitate to nominate themselves. Hence, names appeared on the tickets that would never have been put there by experienced party leaders. With the increase in the number and variety of candidates, the power of the voters rose; and they exercised this power without receiving the advice or feeling the pressure of an organized party. It was for the voters an altogether confusing, exciting, and heady experience. Finally, campaigning took on a new character. Since the candidate did not have a party organization to speak for him, he was compelled to take the stump and "tell his own achievements ne'er performed."<sup>51</sup> Naturally enough, conservatives frowned upon this practice, which they called electioneering,<sup>52</sup> and they claimed that its tendency was to exclude men of superior qualities and education from office. President Joseph Caldwell of the University of North Carolina wrote in 1832 that he had witnessed campaigns in which a candidate's chances of success were jeopardized if it were "thought that he had any pretensions to information or culture, at least beyond a bare capacity to read," whereas the voters would flock to "some miserable being" who "belonged to the class of the ignorant, with whom the greater part considered it their glory to be ranked."<sup>53</sup>

While these comments on the termination of the one-party era are too brief to establish the point, perhaps they suggest the possibility that Jacksonian democracy had an eastern-political as well as a western-frontier ancestry. There are strong indications that manifestations of lusty, undisciplined democracy in the older and more conservative areas were produced in large measure by the disintegration of the only party then in existence and the concomitant shuffling off of party discipline and controls.

<sup>51</sup> Nashville *Whig*, June 30, 1821.

<sup>52</sup> Richmond *Enquirer*, Jan. 3, 1824.

<sup>53</sup> Charles L. Coon, ed., *The Beginnings of Public Education in North Carolina: A Documentary History, 1790-1840* (Raleigh, 1908), II, 563-64.

# Theodore Roosevelt, the American Navy, and the Venezuelan Crisis of 1902-1903

SEWARD W. LIVERMORE\*

## I

FEW episodes in the career of Theodore Roosevelt have caused as much controversy among historians as the part played by the President in settling the difficulties arising out of the Anglo-German naval demonstration against Venezuela in 1902-1903. Roosevelt's story of the manner in which he used the presence of Dewey's fleet in the Caribbean to expedite Germany's acceptance of American arbitration proposals has been roughly treated by critics on the ground that no documentary evidence exists to confirm it, and the Rough Rider has been assailed for perverting the facts of the situation to fit his anti-German views.<sup>1</sup> Most historians have therefore dismissed the story as legendary and discounted Roosevelt's remarks, uttered in the turmoil of the 1916 presidential campaign, as the product of misguided patriotism and political prejudice. On the other hand, there are friends and admirers of the former President who have refused to concede that their hero would so falsify the facts from unworthy motives.<sup>2</sup> The weight of authoritative historical opinion, however, is decidedly against the Roosevelt interpretation of what happened in December, 1902, and January, 1903.

Oddly enough, neither side in the controversy has taken the trouble to investigate very thoroughly one of the major factors in the entire Venezuelan imbroglio. Almost no attention has been paid to the character of the naval

\*The author is with the Division of Research and Publication in the Department of State.

<sup>1</sup> Roosevelt's original story appears in William R. Thayer, *The Life and Letters of John Hay* (New York, 1915), II, 284-95. His subsequent versions of it appear in Howard C. Hill, *Roosevelt and the Caribbean* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 123-34. The principal critics of the story are Alfred Vagts, *Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten in der Weltpolitik* (New York, 1935), II, 1555-1624; and Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1867-1907* (Baltimore, 1937), pp. 335-80.

<sup>2</sup> James Ford Rhodes, *The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations, 1897-1909* (New York, 1922), pp. 252-53; *What Me Befell: The Reminiscences of J. J. Jusserand* (Boston, 1934), pp. 237-39. Jusserand, the French ambassador and a close friend of Roosevelt, took up his post in Washington in February, 1903, at the height of the excitement over Venezuela. Although he adds no additional information, Jusserand insists that the Roosevelt narrative is authentic in all respects.

preparations made by the United States to forestall the contingencies which might occur as a result of the operations of the British and German squadrons against the obnoxious Castro regime. The presence of the American fleet in the Caribbean at that time has never been satisfactorily explained, and references to it in all the accounts of the Venezuelan episode are vague or misleading or both.

Roosevelt states in his celebrated letter to Thayer that when Germany refused to arbitrate, "I assembled our battle fleet under Admiral Dewey, near Porto Rico, for 'maneuvers', with instructions that the fleet should be kept in hand and in fighting trim, and should be ready to sail at an hour's notice."<sup>3</sup> The assumption that Germany would not arbitrate until force had been applied has been vigorously challenged by critics on the ground that the fleet was in the Caribbean before anything was said about arbitration. Furthermore, no such orders to Dewey have as yet been discovered, a fact which has led some historians to deny that the naval concentration at Culebra was planned ahead of time with the Venezuelan situation in view. In their opinion it was a routine maneuver corresponding in point of time with the Anglo-German naval demonstration but having no connection with the diplomatic negotiations. Professor Samuel F. Bemis, for instance, notes the presence of the fleet off Puerto Rico, "a natural wintering place," but maintains that "there seem to have been no formal or informal demands by President Roosevelt on the intervening powers."<sup>4</sup>

Investigators like Dr. Alfred Vagts recognize Roosevelt's responsibility for putting the fleet in the Caribbean at that time but charge him with conniving with the naval authorities and the armament makers to create a war scare between the United States and Germany for the purpose of obtaining more liberal naval appropriations from Congress.<sup>5</sup> Dewey's appointment to command the maneuvers is ascribed by Vagts to Roosevelt's desire to help the Navy profit from the anti-German sentiment associated with the admiral's name since the friction between Dewey and von Diederichs at Manila Bay in 1898. Other historians, impressed by the researches of Vagts, have adopted

<sup>3</sup> Joseph B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Letters* (New York, 1920), II, 222; Hill, p. 124.

<sup>4</sup> Samuel F. Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States* (rev. ed., New York, 1942), p. 524. In *The Latin American Policy of the United States: An Historical Interpretation* (New York, 1943), p. 148, Bemis taxes Roosevelt for taking "inordinate personal credit" for the diplomatic triumph yet concedes that the presence of the fleet in the West Indies was a powerful factor in bringing about that triumph.

<sup>5</sup> Vagts, pp. 1555-57, 1567-68, 1593-94. The naval appropriation bill passed in February, 1903, at the height of the excitement over Venezuela was smaller than the bill passed by the same Congress the year before. The figures for 1903 are \$84,933,697; for 1902 \$85,347,345. Gordon C. O'Gara, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of the Modern Navy* (Princeton, 1943), p. 115.

the same conclusions, but with less animus, out of a desire to spare the reputation of a great American from a charge of deliberate deception. Professor Dexter Perkins, for example, has shifted the onus to the naval authorities who are pictured as pursuing, from ulterior motives of their own, a course in the naval concentration quite at variance with the pacific and conciliatory attitude of the President toward the German government. Roosevelt's responsibility in the matter of the fleet mobilization is dismissed as a characteristic flourish of the Big Stick, intended for home consumption, quite harmless in its general intent, and completely without influence on the course of the negotiations.<sup>6</sup>

If these conclusions are valid, then Roosevelt's account of his ultimatum to the German ambassador would appear to be a fanciful reconstruction without any basis in fact. Although evidence exists that the President saw von Holleben on at least two occasions prior to the German acceptance of the American arbitration proposals, there is no agreement among historians as to what was said at these interviews.<sup>7</sup> The only trace of anything resembling an ultimatum to be found in the German diplomatic documents occurs in a dispatch to the foreign office, not from von Holleben in December, 1902, but from his successor, von Sternburg, in February, 1903, concerning an interview with Roosevelt, who warned the envoy of "secret orders" to Dewey's fleet in the Caribbean to hold itself in readiness for an emergency.<sup>8</sup> This would indicate a certain connection between the naval concentration and the diplomatic negotiations; but occurring as it does almost at the end of the episode, the reference has been taken by some scholars to mean that the crisis did not come at the beginning of the affair as a result of Germany's reluctance to accept the principle of arbitration but arose much later from Germany's insistence on preferential treatment for certain of its claims, a demand which not only delayed the final settlement but was highly unpopular in the United States because of the incidents of German terrorism arising in the course of the blockade.<sup>9</sup> Historians who have accepted this interpretation have conceded that Roosevelt was badly confused when he came to narrate the story in 1915-

<sup>6</sup> Perkins, pp. 335-36.

<sup>7</sup> Alfred L. P. Dennis, *Adventures in American Diplomacy, 1896-1906* (New York, 1928), p. 290, puts the dates of these interviews as December 10 and 16 and finds no discrepancy between Roosevelt's statement and the documentary evidence. Henry F. Pringle, *Theodore Roosevelt: A Biography* (New York, 1931), pp. 284-89, cites evidence for these interviews but thinks Roosevelt's story romantically absurd.

<sup>8</sup> *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914* (70 vols., Berlin, 1922-27), XVII, 285-86; Chester Lloyd Jones, *The Caribbean since 1900* (New York, 1936), p. 247.

<sup>9</sup> Hill, p. 146; J. Fred Rippy, *Latin America in World Politics: An Outline Survey* (New York, 1928), p. 195; Lionel M. Gelber, *The Rise of Anglo-American Friendship: A Study in World Politics, 1898-1906* (New York, 1938), pp. 114-15.



1916. Critics, however, have swept aside this effort to make the Roosevelt account square with the documents by denying that the Venezuelan affair ever reached a crisis, either at the beginning or at the end. In their opinion it was a routine diplomatic matter, handled in a normal manner by accredited representatives of the various foreign offices concerned and uninfluenced by the presence of the American fleet in the Caribbean, whatever Roosevelt may have thought or said to the contrary.<sup>10</sup>

Historians who have relied upon the Thayer-Roosevelt account of what happened in 1902 have been misled by the President's failure to indicate explicitly the conditions under which the fleet was assembled in the West Indies.<sup>11</sup> A surprising illustration of this occurs in a history of the American Navy by an eminent authority in that particular field. Referring to the activities of the allies—Italy, Germany and England—Captain Knox says, "They declared a formal blockade on December 20th, thus creating a state of belligerency, and this challenge to the Monroe Doctrine was met by the mobilization at Culebra, near Porto Rico, of all available naval vessels from North Atlantic, South Atlantic and European Squadrons, with Admiral Dewey in chief command."<sup>12</sup> The inference that Roosevelt waited until the blockade was established before mobilizing the fleet is at variance with the President's assertion that he ordered the concentration only after Germany had refused to arbitrate. Neither statement is correct in regard to time. On the other hand, the historians who have attempted to demolish the Roosevelt story altogether have themselves fallen into error in the same respect. One of his principal critics has stated that in October, 1902, the Navy Department, conscious of the possibility of intervention in Venezuela, added to Rear Admiral Joseph B. Coghlan's Caribbean squadron three other squadrons and put them under the supreme command of Admiral Dewey for the ostensible purpose of winter maneuvers.<sup>13</sup> As a matter of fact, the concentration under Dewey's personal command did not take place until December 8, the day after the Anglo-German ultimatum to Venezuela, while preparations for the mobilization had all been made several months prior to October.<sup>14</sup> This error can be

<sup>10</sup> Perkins, pp. 354, 380-87.

<sup>11</sup> For a typically garbled account see George Fort Milton, *The Use of Presidential Power, 1789-1943* (Boston, 1944), pp. 182-83.

<sup>12</sup> Dudley W. Knox, *A History of the United States Navy* (New York, 1936), p. 375. Germany and Italy would not admit the existence of a state of belligerency, because to do so would deprive their squadrons of the use of the neutral port of Willemstad, Curaçao, without which they could not have maintained the blockade of their section of the Venezuelan coast. The British, who coaled from their own bases at Trinidad and Jamaica, also had reservations with respect to the existence of a state of war.

<sup>13</sup> Perkins, p. 335.

<sup>14</sup> *Annual Reports of the Navy Department for the Year 1903* (58 Congress, 2 session, *House Document No. 3*, Serial 4642), pp. 642-50. Hereafter cited *Annual Reports 1903*.

traced back to Vagts, who cites a Washington newspaper as his authority, and it has influenced the author of a recent work on American diplomatic history to say that the Navy Department, anticipating the Anglo-German move, "concentrated its forces in the Caribbean under Commodore [*sic*] Dewey in October 1902."<sup>15</sup> The author then goes on to remark, "The American naval concentration at Puerto Rico was undoubtedly salutary, though the administration seems not to have planned it in the first place." Just who did plan it is not mentioned, and in the next sentence Roosevelt is charged with drawing upon his imagination in later years to magnify the episode into a first-class diplomatic crisis.<sup>16</sup> An examination of the naval records would have cleared up a few of the misconceptions prevailing in regard to the Venezuelan affair. It is not possible from these documents to settle all the moot points, but the question of the naval concentration and Roosevelt's connection with it can, at least, be easily determined.

## II

Naval preparations for the defense of the Caribbean had been under way for some time prior to the appearance of Theodore Roosevelt in the White House.<sup>17</sup> War plans, based upon strategic features and the number of naval vessels available to put them into operation, had already been drawn up by the General Board, with the knowledge and approval of President McKinley, for the purpose of affording adequate protection to American interests in that region.<sup>18</sup> In June, 1901, the General Board reported to the Secretary of the Navy that for eighteen months experienced officers had been studying the tactical and strategic questions presented by control of the Caribbean. "There was no uncertainty in the minds of the Board," read the report, "as to the natural sphere of our control in those regions with definite geographical limits in which the Navy may sustain it in war and beyond which the Navy cannot

<sup>15</sup> Vagts, p. 1555; Richard W. Van Alstyne, *American Diplomacy in Action: A Series of Case Studies* (Stanford University, 1944), pp. 114-15.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Dewey to Long, June 28, 1901, File 11158-17, Office of the Secretary of the Navy (hereafter cited O.S.N.), Navy Department Archives. "When Congress meets next week," wrote Dewey, "the General Board will have been in existence nearly two years. During that time it has accomplished a large amount of work in the development of war plans and in that methodical preparation which means economy and efficiency in peace . . . and in time of war." For the nature of some of these plans see "Résumé of the Work of the General Board, 1901," Dewey Papers, Library of Congress.

<sup>18</sup> In 1901 reconnaissances had been made by naval officers of the islands of Santo Domingo and Martinique, looking to the seizure of those places by the Navy in the event of a Caribbean war. Crowninshield to Haines, Aug. 19, 1901, Case 3399, General Correspondence, Office of Naval Intelligence (hereafter cited O.N.I.).

maintain in war any such control.”<sup>19</sup> The board was not concerned with the government’s policies in the abstract. Its duty was to prepare war plans for the fleet “in such a manner as to make good in time of war the principles of its Government.” The Caribbean and its shores could be dominated in time of war if the Navy retained in time of peace certain vantage points on the Cuban coast and a strongly fortified base in Puerto Rican waters. Beyond these limits the defense of the South American continent could not be guaranteed with the naval forces then in the possession of the United States. “Whether the principle of the Monroe Doctrine,” the report continued, “so far as it is the policy of the Government, covers all South America, including Patagonia and the Argentine, is not for the consideration of the General Board; but only the fact that the principles of strategy and the defects of our geographical position make it impracticable successfully to maintain naval control by armed force beyond the Amazon unless present conditions are radically changed.”<sup>20</sup>

Effective control of the Caribbean required suitable bases, and in this respect the Navy was seriously handicapped. Although Puerto Rico had been acquired as one of the fruits of the war with Spain, the harbor and naval station at San Juan had proved too small to be of much service as an operating base for a fleet of any size.<sup>21</sup> In order to rectify this situation the government undertook in January, 1902, to purchase the Virgin Islands from Denmark so that the port of St. Thomas might afford the additional facilities demanded by the fleet.<sup>22</sup> No bases could be obtained from Cuba until the military occupation of that island had come to an end and then the matter would have to be adjusted with the new Cuban government.<sup>23</sup> In the meantime the General Board had set to work to remedy these deficiencies. At its direction Culebra Island, a few miles off the eastern end of Puerto Rico, was put into condition in the winter of 1901-1902 to serve as a fulcrum from which American naval power was to be applied to the entire region.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Report of the General Board, No. 171, June 25, 1901, Dewey Papers. This report was laid before President McKinley at a cabinet meeting in July. Long to Dewey, July 8, 1901, File 11158-18, O.S.N.

<sup>20</sup> Report of the General Board, No. 171.

<sup>21</sup> Bradford to Long, May 20, 1901, and Hackett to Allen, June 21, 1901, File 10602-5, O.S.N. In January, 1901, Mahan wrote to Rear Admiral Henry C. Taylor, “One thing is evident, Porto Rico has no good defensive harbor and the way we slopped over about Cuba in the weeks preceding the war deprives us of any of her ports. St. Thomas seems almost a necessity.” Taylor to Dewey, Jan. 10, 1901, Dewey Papers.

<sup>22</sup> Mahan to Lodge, Aug. 4, 1898, Henry Cabot Lodge Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. Mahan urged upon the senator the acquisition of St. Thomas as a “distinct addition to the military strength of Porto Rico, considered as a naval base.”

<sup>23</sup> The Navy used the old Spanish naval base at Havana until March, 1903, when it was compelled to evacuate it and accept undeveloped sites at Bahia Honda and Guantánamo. Cortelyou to Long, Apr. 12, 1902, expressing Roosevelt’s dissatisfaction with the Navy Department’s reluctance to abandon Havana. John D. Long Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.

<sup>24</sup> In August, 1901, the General Board recommended to the department the preparation of

Tension began to develop about this time with Germany over a threatened demonstration by the kaiser's navy against Venezuela. On December 13, 1901, the German foreign office announced the intention of the government to take stringent measures to collect the money owed to German citizens. A blockade of the principal harbors might bring Castro to terms, but "if this measure does not seem sufficient, we would have to consider the temporary occupation on our part of different Venezuelan harbor places and the levying of duty in those places."<sup>25</sup> Hay's reply on December 16, while not objecting specifically to the German proposal, indicated a reluctance on the part of the United States to endorse such action. To the Navy Department it appeared to be a possible move in the direction of alienating American territory for naval base purposes in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine. An investigation of conditions in Venezuela was ordered; and the General Board sent one of its members, Commander John E. Pillsbury, to report upon the situation. Pillsbury's report was not encouraging. With it he enclosed a clipping from a Port of Spain newspaper regarding the arrival from Martinique of the tourist steamer *Prinzessin Victoria Luise* with a crowd of American tourists and six guests of the German emperor. "The six guests of the German emperor," wrote Pillsbury, "are six Army officers on a cruise for information. From those with whom I conversed, the 'impression' is that Germany means to put all possible pressure on Venezuela."<sup>26</sup> Rear Admiral Henry C. Taylor, chief of the Bureau of Navigation, sent the report to Admiral Dewey as "significant of the general trend of events, and Pillsbury is a careful man. I am glad that the German Emperor shows a friendly spirit. His brother's visit will doubtless postpone war and we need the delay in order to get our enlisted men in trim."<sup>27</sup>

Germany put off the proposed demonstration indefinitely but not before the jingo press of the United States succeeded in raising a mild war scare over the issue. Much was made at the time of the assemblage of a number of American warships at Culebra and of the presence on that island of a battalion of marines which was to be sent to Venezuela if the necessity arose.<sup>28</sup> These preparations, however, were hardly more than a coincidence arising from the

---

Culebra as a base "to be established in case of sudden war." Dewey to Long, Aug. 28, 1901, File 11158-19, O.S.N. On December 17 President Roosevelt issued an executive order placing Culebra and the adjacent keys under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department. Bradford to Long, Dec. 28, 1901, File 10602-14, *ibid*.

<sup>25</sup> Jones, p. 220; Hill, p. 112.

<sup>26</sup> Pillsbury to Taylor, Jan. 16, 1902, Dewey Papers.

<sup>27</sup> Taylor to Dewey, Jan. 31, 1902, *ibid*.

<sup>28</sup> New York *Sun*, Jan. 1, 3, 11, 15; *Army and Navy Journal*, XXXIX, 469 (Jan. 11, 1902); *Public Opinion*, XXXII, 36-37 (Jan. 9, 1902). According to the *Sun*, the strength of the German fleet en route to South America was two armored cruisers and three light cruisers, totaling 15,850 tons and carrying 107 guns and 1,740 men.

initial efforts of the Navy Department to put Culebra in shape as an operating base for the fleet in the Caribbean. Lack of sufficient warships kept the maneuvers on an elementary level; and beyond demonstrating the utility of Culebra for naval purposes, little was accomplished by the Navy during the first phase of the Venezuelan affair.<sup>29</sup>

When Castro showed no signs of coming to terms with his foreign creditors, the Navy Department took precautions to be ready for whatever contingencies might develop from the postponed intervention.<sup>30</sup> In January the House Committee on Naval Affairs was asked to include in the forthcoming appropriation bill the sum of \$120,000 to defray the expense of a fleet mobilization in the Caribbean at the end of the year.<sup>31</sup> In February the State Department was requested to obtain from its consuls and diplomatic agents in Venezuela information about the principal roads and landing places along the coast of that republic.<sup>32</sup> Further evidence of German designs on Venezuela became apparent that spring when the flagship of the German squadron in South American waters, the 6,000-ton armored cruiser *Vineta*, put into Newport News for a complete overhauling after two years spent in tropical waters. The Office of Naval Intelligence discovered that the officers of the cruiser had been in touch with Castro in regard to coaling station sites in Venezuela and that the *Vineta* intended to resume operations against the dictator once repairs had been completed and a fresh complement of men had been received from Germany.<sup>33</sup>

Plans for the defense of the Venezuelan coast were immediately drawn up by the General Board and sent to the commander of the naval forces in the Caribbean. The admiral was instructed to appoint a board of naval officers to make a careful reconnaissance of the terrain most likely to be occupied by German forces as well as a detailed examination of all localities where landing operations might be effected. What was wanted, said Moody, was an efficient plan of offense and defense; and the admiral was warned to do nothing to arouse suspicion.<sup>34</sup> In December, after the delivery of the Anglo-

<sup>29</sup> *Annual Reports of the Navy Department for the Year 1902* (57 Cong., 2 sess., House Document No. 3, Serial 4455), pp. 393-94. Before this the Navy had never attempted peacetime maneuvers in the Caribbean. The vessels that congregated in the West Indies during the winter months spent the time in aimless cruising between the various ports. The admiral in command in 1902 reported (p. 494) that this cruising interfered with the maneuvers to such an extent that year as to make the operations of little value.

<sup>30</sup> George T. Davis, *A Navy Second to None: The Development of Modern American Naval Policy* (New York, 1940), p. 123.

<sup>31</sup> Long to Foss, Jan. 23, 1902, File 11158-25, O.S.N.

<sup>32</sup> Vagts, p. 1555, n. 3.

<sup>33</sup> Kittelle to Sigsbee, May 31, 1902, Case 4367, General Correspondence, O.N.I.

<sup>34</sup> Moody to the Senior Officer Present, Caribbean Forces, July 9, 1902, Case 4899, *ibid.* Lest a knowledge of these plans leak out, the American naval attachés in Germany and Japan

German ultimatum to Venezuela, the Navy Department detached an officer from the fleet for special duty as naval attaché to the legation in Caracas.<sup>35</sup> Lieutenant Marbury Johnston reached La Guaira on the cruiser *Albany* on December 16 and reported at once to the American minister. The attaché made a systematic survey of all harbors, coastal roads, and fortifications and obtained from the Venezuelan authorities an accurate knowledge of the state of the republic's defenses, including the number and caliber of the guns in all the forts, the amount of ammunition on hand, and the number and quality of Venezuelan troops available for the repulse of an invader.<sup>36</sup> With such information in its possession the Navy felt confident of its ability to checkmate a German move in the direction of establishing a foothold on the South American coast. The "secret orders" mentioned in the Roosevelt story refer in all probability to these plans; and while Dewey may never have received specific instructions from Washington, he was not at a loss to know what to do had it become necessary to move the fleet into Venezuelan waters.

In the meantime the Navy Department spared no effort to make the fleet mobilization a success.<sup>37</sup> On June 9 Rear Admiral Francis J. Higginson, commander in chief of the main battle force, received his orders in regard to the proposed combination of the various squadrons and the course of action which he was to follow.<sup>38</sup> A few days later Admiral Dewey consented to assume command of the combined naval force in person, thus setting a precedent as the first Admiral of the Navy to hoist his four-starred flag at sea in command of a fighting force. President Roosevelt, who was counting on Dewey's reputation to discourage the Germans from any serious undertaking against Venezuela, was greatly pleased at the admiral's decision. He wrote,

I have been very anxious that this, our first effort to have Navy maneuvers on a large scale in time of peace, should be under your direction. It will be a good thing from the professional standpoint; and what is more, your standing, not only in this nation but abroad, is such that the effect of your presence will be very beneficial outside of the service.<sup>39</sup>

---

were forbidden by the chief intelligence officer to attend the summer maneuvers of the fleets of the nations to which they were accredited because the German naval attaché in Washington would be quick to demand reciprocal privileges in connection with the winter maneuvers in the Caribbean. Sigsbee to Marsh, Aug. 14, 1902, Case 4313, *ibid*.

<sup>35</sup> *Annual Reports*, 1903, pp. 503, 578.

<sup>36</sup> Johnston to Sigsbee, Jan. 28, 1903, Case 4855, General Correspondence, O.N.I.

<sup>37</sup> Early in June, news of the forthcoming mobilization was given to the press, which noisily announced the assembling of the greatest fighting fleet in American history with Roosevelt in supreme command assisted by Moody and Dewey and a number of distinguished flag officers. *New York Sun*, June 4, 1902; *New York Tribune*, June 15, 1902.

<sup>38</sup> Official Records of the North Atlantic Squadron, May 30/02-Feb. 1/03, Office of the Bureau of Navigation (hereafter O.B.N.), Navy Department Archives.

<sup>39</sup> Roosevelt to Dewey, June 14, 1902, Dewey Papers.



In July the Secretary of the Navy sent a memorandum to all bureaus to the effect that the President was deeply interested in the success of the forthcoming concentration. "The Department," said Moody, "desires a hearty and vigorous cooperation on the part of all Bureaus and Naval Stations concerned in order that this mobilization of the fleet may be successfully accomplished. The Secretary feels that this mobilization is a test of our ability to meet war demands."<sup>40</sup> On November 18 Dewey received his orders to proceed to Culebra.<sup>41</sup> By this time Germany and England had concluded their arrangements for a joint naval demonstration against Venezuela and on November 25 informed the State Department of the fact.<sup>42</sup> Dewey left Washington on December 1, and a week later he assumed command of the fleet, hoisting his flag on the gunboat *Mayflower*.<sup>43</sup> On that day, December 8, Great Britain and Germany broke off diplomatic relations with Venezuela and precipitated the controversy in the settlement of which Roosevelt claimed to have played such a prominent part.

The maneuvers themselves are of considerable significance in relation to the crisis which developed in the Venezuelan affair. The Caribbean squadron, consisting of four cruisers and two gunboats, arrived at Culebra on November 5; sixteen days later the four battleships of the North Atlantic squadron dropped anchor off the island.<sup>44</sup> A battalion of six hundred marines was put ashore to man the mobile defenses of the operating base and to act as an expeditionary force against any other point in the Caribbean which it might become necessary to occupy.<sup>45</sup> The first phase of the maneuvers involved a search problem. For this purpose the European and South Atlantic squadrons had been ordered to rendezvous on November 29 in the Gulf of Paria off Trinidad. The combined force of two battleships and four cruisers under the command of Rear Admiral George W. Sumner was to act as a raiding fleet whose objective was some port in Puerto Rican waters.<sup>46</sup> From his base at Culebra, Rear Admiral Higginson was given the task of intercepting the raiding fleet and engaging it with his superior force of battleships before it

<sup>40</sup> Memorandum for All Bureaus, July 24, 1902, *ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> Moody to Dewey, Nov. 18, 1902, Henry Cabot Lodge Papers. Dewey's instructions on assuming command were (1) to secure uniformity in squadron exercises, (2) to carry out a study of tactics under steam in developing theories enunciated by the War College, and (3) to familiarize officers with the waters of Puerto Rico and vicinity. Venezuela was not mentioned.

<sup>42</sup> Dennis, p. 287.

<sup>43</sup> Journal of the Commander-in-Chief, December 1902-January 1903 (entry for Jan. 13, 1903), Dewey Papers. This journal was kept for Dewey during his few weeks afloat by one of his aides and concerns routine technical matters connected with the concentration.

<sup>44</sup> *Annual Reports*, 1903, pp. 626-31. The torpedo flotilla, which arrived November 25, numbered seven vessels. There were numerous auxiliary vessels, colliers, etc.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 646.

<sup>46</sup> Journal of the Commander-in-Chief.

could reach its objective. A deficiency of fast cruisers able to keep him informed of the enemy's movements prevented Higginson from locating Sumner's fleet, which passed a long distance to the east of the Windward Islands and came down undetected through Mona Passage to Mayaguez in Puerto Rico.<sup>47</sup> The search problem was completed on December 9, and during the second phase of the maneuvers all the squadrons were combined into one grand fleet for extensive exercises and drills in the waters about Culebra. Part of the time was devoted to practice in landing fully armed and equipped expeditions from the warships along the wilder parts of the Puerto Rican coast in anticipation of what might be required in Venezuela under similar circumstances.<sup>48</sup> These exercises came to an end about December 20, after which the fleet was dispersed among the West Indian ports for the Christmas holidays. At the end of the month the ships were reassembled at Culebra for another period of tactical drill in fleet formation until January 5 when Admiral Dewey hauled down his flag and returned to Washington.<sup>49</sup>

The war games had revealed serious shortcomings in the naval establishment in the way of equipment and experience, but the naval authorities had every reason to feel satisfied with what had been accomplished with the material at their disposal. They were also convinced of the salutary effect of this demonstration of American naval power on the course of events in Venezuela. In the journal kept of Dewey's activities during his brief command afloat, the following entry occurs on January 3, 1903:

The work laid out so long ago and with such care . . . is now ended and successfully accomplished. When one considers the technical success of the mobilization of so large a naval force 1,500 miles from home, and the effect on foreign powers, particularly at the present moment of the demonstration against Venezuela, of so powerful and mobile a fleet in the Caribbean, it can only be considered as a work redounding immensely to our naval and national prestige.<sup>50</sup>

Although in a larger sense these maneuvers were designed to serve as a pattern of defense for the entire Caribbean area, the Venezuelan episode had promised for a time to afford the Navy an opportunity for a practical demonstration of what had been accomplished to date in that direction.

### III

Whether or not Roosevelt ever delivered an ultimatum to the German ambassador on December 10, the fact remains that he had put himself in an

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Annual Reports, 1903*, p. 648. Venezuela is not specifically mentioned but the inference is fairly obvious.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 627; *Journal of the Commander-in-Chief.*

<sup>50</sup> *Journal of the Commander-in-Chief.*

excellent position with the Navy to bring considerable pressure to bear upon the intervening powers in the event of a breakdown in the negotiations. How active the President was during this period in behalf of arbitration cannot be stated with certainty, although his intense interest in the acceptance of the idea as the best solution for the difficulty is apparent from his correspondence.<sup>51</sup> Roosevelt's attitude at the time was marked by an unusual display of prudence and caution and was characterized by none of the absurd rodomontade of Cleveland and Olney in their handling of the Venezuelan boundary dispute seven years before. The country had then been ill-prepared to make good its pretensions in the foreign field, but with a fleet at his disposal in 1902 Roosevelt could feel more confident of achieving results in harmony with the interests of the United States. Some indication of the diplomatic value of the naval concentration to the President is apparent from a report made to the Secretary of the Navy on December 25, 1902, by Rear Admiral Henry C. Taylor, who served as Dewey's chief of staff for the period of the Caribbean maneuvers. Referring to a communication just received from Captain William S. Cowles, acting chief of the Bureau of Navigation in Washington in the absence of Taylor, the latter said:

Cowles also writes that the presence of the fleet in these waters, concentrated and organized for work, was probably a convenience to the administration in discussing the Venezuelan situation. I am very glad that this was so, although the concentration was not suggested with any reason but that of perfecting the efficiency of the fleet.<sup>52</sup>

Although by no means conclusive proof of Roosevelt's active interposition in the Venezuelan affair, these remarks reflect the opinion of an official who was at all times fairly close to the administration. Cowles, who was Roosevelt's brother-in-law and naval aide to the President, was in a better position than most people to know what went on behind the scenes in Washington. As to Taylor's statement, it is quite obvious that the business of perfecting the efficiency of the fleet was undertaken primarily with the German menace in mind.<sup>53</sup>

The slowness with which the German government accepted the principle of arbitration seemed to many to belie the pacific nature of the officially stated German intentions.<sup>54</sup> According to dispatches from the American ambassador

<sup>51</sup> Roosevelt to Albert Shaw, Dec. 26, 1902, quoted in Albert Shaw, *International Bearings of American Policy* (Baltimore, 1943), p. 221. See also Vagts, p. 1586.

<sup>52</sup> Taylor to Moody, Dec. 25, 1902, William H. Moody Papers, Library of Congress.

<sup>53</sup> Alfred Vagts, "Hopes and Fears of an American-German War, 1870-1915," *Political Science Quarterly*, LIV (1939), 525-32. See also the so-called Taylor Memorandum, printed in Dennis, pp. 291-92, and discussed by Gelber, p. 114.

<sup>54</sup> The *Wall Street Journal*, which sympathized strongly with the Anglo-German effort to collect the debts owed by Venezuela, stated (Dec. 16, 1902) that the naval intervention had already gone beyond anything the State Department had been led to expect at the outset.

in Berlin, the authorities there were too engrossed with a discussion of the character of the blockade to be established along the Venezuelan coast to pay much attention to the other matter; and it was not until December 19 that Germany announced its acceptance of the proposals.<sup>55</sup> Meanwhile the question arose as to the dispersal of the several squadrons of the American fleet among the West Indian ports for the Christmas holidays. The Navy Department had planned to send the battleship squadron to Trinidad close to Venezuelan territorial waters and the scene of the Anglo-German naval operations. In view of the delicacy of the international situation Rear Admiral Taylor telegraphed to Washington on December 14 asking further confirmation of the plan.<sup>56</sup> Any movement of the fleet in the direction of Venezuela at this time would be certain to have repercussions in diplomatic circles; and it gave the President an opportunity, if he wished for one, to placate the interventionist powers by removing the last element of danger from the naval concentration. On December 18, however, before word had been received from Germany as to the final decision in the matter of arbitration, the Navy Department telegraphed Admiral Dewey to carry out his proposed itinerary.<sup>57</sup>

An announcement to that effect appeared in the morning newspapers on December 18 and brought forth an immediate reaction from the German embassy in Washington.<sup>58</sup> Von Quadt, the chargé d'affaires, at once sought an interview with the Secretary of State in regard to the intentions of the American government. Hay gave his visitor the usual assurances of mutual trust and esteem which are customary on such occasions; at the same time he warned the envoy that public opinion in the country had become so disturbed that, unless Germany quickly reached an agreement on arbitration, Congress might adopt a resolution directing the President to look to the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine.<sup>59</sup> The significance of this warning has been overlooked by historians of the episode, although Hay's remarks were as close to a direct threat as it was possible to come in diplomatic parlance. Congress was by no means out of hand in regard to Venezuela, and the President was sufficiently in control of his party in foreign affairs to block any resolution not directly sponsored by himself.<sup>60</sup> It is not too much to assume that pressure

<sup>55</sup> *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1903* (Washington, 1904), pp. 420-24, 792-98. Hereafter cited *Foreign Relations, 1903*.

<sup>56</sup> Taylor to Moody, Dec. 14, 1902, Moody Papers.

<sup>57</sup> Moody to Dewey, Dec. 18, 1902, Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, The National Archives. Hereafter cited N.R.C.

<sup>58</sup> Bishop, I, 227.

<sup>59</sup> *Die Grosse Politik*, XVII, 269.

<sup>60</sup> Senator Henry Cabot Lodge expressed a strong desire to avoid any sort of complication or trouble with Germany over Venezuela and felt that the British were largely responsible for the unsatisfactory state of affairs. Lodge to Henry L. Higginson, Dec. 19, 1902, and Lodge to George Von L. Meyer, Dec. 26, 1902, Henry Cabot Lodge Papers.

of an indirect sort was being applied to the Germans at this stage, however much the administration desired to avoid the appearance of coercion in the matter.

In reporting his interview with Hay to the foreign office, von Quadt informed the imperial chancellor that Dewey had received orders to divide his squadrons among the West Indian ports lest the admiral be tempted to take some rash action with the fleet on his own initiative. This curious explanation of Dewey's movements has been accepted by critics at its face value as a precaution not out of place considering the dangerous character of the naval maneuvers.<sup>61</sup> It is very doubtful if any admiral, however pugnacious, would take a step involving such grave consequences without consulting his government in advance. The movement alluded to by von Quadt was a routine one, scheduled months in advance, and only carried out after confirmatory orders had been received from the Navy Department. Furthermore, the von Quadt telegram has been cited by Perkins and Vagts as proof of Roosevelt's intense desire to avoid irritating the German government under any circumstances.<sup>62</sup> Had the President ordered the warships back to the United States on December 18, or confined them to the vicinity of Culebra Island, such an interpretation might be a valid one. What has been overlooked is the fact that with the battleship squadron at Trinidad the principal fighting force of the United States was five hundred miles closer than Culebra to the scene of possible action during the critical days when the blockade was being put into effect. The cruisers and gunboats of the fleet were scattered among the island ports of Curaçao, St. Kitts, Antigua, and St. Thomas in position for a quick concentration at almost any point in the Caribbean.<sup>63</sup> Admiral Dewey kept a fast torpedo boat constantly on duty at San Juan to facilitate the rapid communication of cable dispatches from the Navy Department.<sup>64</sup> No hostile intent was involved in these preparations, but the Navy was probably better prepared for an emergency than at any time in its previous history. The effect upon the German embassy, moreover, seems to have been disquieting; and during the next ten days von Quadt made a number of visits to the State Department seeking reassurance from Hay on the attitude of the American government.<sup>65</sup> Why this was necessary if everyone at the time was convinced of Roosevelt's utter impartiality in the matter is difficult to understand.

As additional proof of Roosevelt's disinterestedness in the Venezuelan affair it has been asserted that the Navy Department withdrew the gunboat

<sup>61</sup> Vagts, *Deutschland*, p. 1622.

<sup>62</sup> Perkins, p. 346; Vagts, *Deutschland*, pp. 1621-22.

<sup>63</sup> *Annual Reports*, 1903, p. 627, gives the exact location of all the vessels.

<sup>64</sup> Dewey to Moody, telegram, Dec. 16, 1902, N.R.C.

<sup>65</sup> Perkins, pp. 346-47. Von Quadt made at least three calls at this time.

*Marietta* from Venezuelan waters and sent it to Curaçao in order to avoid all appearance of supporting the Venezuelan government.<sup>66</sup> This statement is not borne out by the official report of the Bureau of Navigation on the movements of naval vessels for the year 1902-1903. The records indicate that the *Marietta* was at La Guaira from December 12 to 29 "to look after United States interests." From December 30 to January 5 the gunboat was at Curaçao taking on coal and stores.<sup>67</sup> The letter from the Secretary of the Navy, cited by Vagts, was written on January 3, on which date the vessel was at Curaçao; but otherwise no alteration in its routine appears in the official records of the Navy Department. Some months after the event, in a speech praising Roosevelt's handling of the situation in Venezuela, Secretary of the Navy Moody said:

This country was never upon the borders of a greater peril than at the time of the Venezuela difficulty. . . . We had a battle fleet within reaching distance. There was ample temptation to make a demonstration. I say that rash impulse would have sent that fleet to the zone of danger. . . . We sent simply the little *Marietta* there for purposes of observation. We brought peace and not the sword.<sup>68</sup>

It was not necessary to station more than a single gunboat in Venezuelan waters for the immediate protection of American citizens. The administration had no intention of interfering in the intervention unless compelled to do so by the failure of the diplomatic negotiations. In the meantime the fleet could afford all the coverage that was necessary from its operating base at Culebra or from the other West Indian ports.

The end of the maneuvers on January 5, followed by the breakup of the naval concentration at Culebra, did not signify that the administration had relaxed its grip upon the situation in the Caribbean.<sup>69</sup> According to Perkins, the government at Washington would hardly have taken such a step if it had intended some act of force or menace; but again neglect to follow up the naval movements has led to erroneous conclusions.<sup>70</sup> On that date six small cruisers were detached from the fleet and returned to their stations in Europe and the South Atlantic, but the battleship squadron under Rear Admiral Higginson was kept at Culebra during the month of January to carry out gun

<sup>66</sup> Vagts, *Deutschland*, p. 1622, n. 3.

<sup>67</sup> Log Books of the U.S.S. *Marietta*, Navy Department Archives. See also the reports of Lieutenant Commander S. W. B. Diehl of the *Marietta* to the Navy Department, Dec. 14, 16, 1902, Jan. 4, 1903, N.R.C.

<sup>68</sup> Draft of a speech, undated, in Moody Papers.

<sup>69</sup> Tyler Dennett, *John Hay, from Poetry to Politics* (New York, 1934), p. 394, rejects the Hill-Rippy hypothesis on the ground that the fleet had been demobilized three weeks before the appearance of von Sternburg in Washington.

<sup>70</sup> Perkins, p. 383, says that the fleet "was being broken up as early as January 9" but gives no citation.



drills and target practice in conjunction with the Caribbean cruiser squadron under Rear Admiral Coghlan.<sup>71</sup> During February and March the battleships repaired to the Gulf of Mexico where similar exercises were carried out on the training grounds off Pensacola, while the Caribbean squadron embarked the marine battalion at Culebra on February 3 for a two months' cruise to the West Indian ports. At no time until April 30, when most of the ships came north for refitting at the navy yards, was the United States without a heavy representation of naval force in the Caribbean region.<sup>72</sup> The battleships which had hitherto been kept on foreign stations as a token of American naval power were now retained with Higginson's squadron to which new capital ships were added as fast as they were turned out of the dockyards.<sup>73</sup> Thus when von Sternburg, the new German envoy, arrived in Washington at the end of January and had his oft-cited interview with Roosevelt on February 3, the President could still refer with perfect accuracy to the presence of Dewey's fleet in the Caribbean and to "secret orders," which had not been cancelled, to hold the vessels in readiness for an emergency.<sup>74</sup> Dewey, of course, was no longer in personal command, but the magic of his name could still be used to impress the Germans with the advisability of coming to satisfactory terms with Venezuela.

The Hill-Rippy hypothesis of a confusion in names and dates in the Roosevelt narrative is untenable if the naval movements prior to the recall of von Holleben and the arrival of von Sternburg are taken into consideration.<sup>75</sup> The obduracy of the German government in regard to certain terms of the arbitration and the wanton bombardment of the Venezuelan forts on January 17 by German warships increased the public irritation and stretched the President's patience but produced no crisis.<sup>76</sup> Had the crisis come in this period, the Navy Department would not have abandoned Culebra on February 3, the day of the Roosevelt-Sternburg interview. Since the retention of this base was essential to the maintenance of the fleet on a war footing in the Caribbean, the embarkation of the marine battalion and the removal

<sup>71</sup> *Annual Reports*, 1903, pp. 627-33. The fighting value of the cruisers detached from the main fleet was negligible nor were they of much use as scouts.

<sup>72</sup> Taylor to Moody, Dec. 28, 1902, Moody Papers. Taylor expressed the hope that no ships would have to come north for a considerable period for repairs, for "I take it that you would like to keep a respectable force all ready for service in case it is needed."

<sup>73</sup> O'Gara, pp. 74-75.

<sup>74</sup> *Die Grosse Politik*, XVII, 286; Perkins, p. 382.

<sup>75</sup> Rippy in a later book, *The Caribbean Danger Zone* (New York, 1940), p. 35, flatly rejects the entire Roosevelt narrative.

<sup>76</sup> Lodge to Henry White, Feb. 7, 1903, and Lodge to Henry L. Higginson, Feb. 9, 1903, Henry Cabot Lodge Papers. Lodge felt that public opinion held England responsible for these outrages because the Germans, who had a natural tendency to act as they had, were encouraged to do so from behind the protection of their alliance with Great Britain.

of the defense equipment would have been delayed until international conditions had cleared.<sup>77</sup>

Other evidence to support the theory of a later crisis has been adduced from a letter of Roosevelt's, dated February 5, 1903, to the Bureau of Navigation requesting information about the strength of the German squadron in Venezuelan waters.<sup>78</sup> Critics have inferred from the President's delay in acquainting himself with such an important subject that the presence of foreign naval forces in the Caribbean had been a matter of complete indifference to him up to that time.<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, a glance at the daily newspapers would have kept Roosevelt pretty accurately informed of the number of warships engaged in the Venezuelan affair. The press, from the beginning of the intervention, had shown a lively concern about the size of the squadrons operating off Venezuela and had speculated noisily on the dangers to be anticipated from an increase in numbers.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, the Navy Department received daily reports by cable from the commanding officer of the *Marietta* at La Guaira on the progress of the blockade.<sup>81</sup> Since the President's naval aide was also acting chief of naval operations, it is not likely that Roosevelt remained in ignorance of what was happening off the Venezuelan coast.

The readiness of the allied governments to rush additional warships to South America, depending upon the turn of events, was a subject of persistent rumor and report. In view of the unsettled state of American opinion with respect to the intervention, the truth or falsity of these stories was a matter of some importance to the administration. As early as November 28 the embassy at Berlin reported three German cruisers being fitted out at the dockyards preparatory to service in Venezuelan waters, a report which was later modified by the information that the vessels had not received orders to sail but were being held in port in a condition of readiness.<sup>82</sup> On December 18 the naval attaché in Berlin cabled his department about a new cruiser division which the Germans were organizing for service on the east American station, although no immediate reinforcements were contemplated.<sup>83</sup> According to a Reuter's dispatch of December 12, a first-class British reserve squadron was

<sup>77</sup> Permanent defenses were not provided for Culebra until 1905, when the island was converted into a naval station. Dewey to Moody, Nov. 24, 1905, File 10602-103, O.S.N.

<sup>78</sup> Hill, p. 144.

<sup>79</sup> Perkins, p. 382; Vagts, *Deutschland*, p. 1622.

<sup>80</sup> Boston *Herald*, Dec. 11, 12, 1902; New York *Times*, Jan. 11, 12, 1903. According to the New York *Herald*, Jan. 22, 1903, the naval budget then before the *Reichstag* put the German navy ahead of the American, while the avowed policy of the government was to add more ships to the fleet in South America as soon as the new cruisers designed for foreign service were commissioned.

<sup>81</sup> U. S. Dept. of State, Miscellaneous Letters, Jan., Feb., 1903. The reports are also in the Office of Naval Records and Library.

<sup>82</sup> *Foreign Relations*, 1903, pp. 417-18.

<sup>83</sup> Potts to Sigsbee, Dec. 18, 1902, Report No. 94, F-10-C, O.N.I.

under orders to be ready to put to sea, while a Rome dispatch of January 7 announced that three more Italian cruisers had been ordered to the Caribbean.<sup>84</sup> Official intimation of an impending change reached the Navy Department on January 17 when the commander of the *Marietta*, reporting upon a critical shortage in the coal supply at Willemstad, the Caribbean port upon which the German and Italian squadrons were based, said that new coal sheds were being built and the stockpile greatly augmented in anticipation of the arrival of more German and Italian warships.<sup>85</sup>

No actual change in the number of blockading warships occurred until January 21, when the third-class Italian cruiser *Elba* arrived at Curaçao.<sup>86</sup> Italian participation in the blockade was not taken very seriously, and the advent of this small 2,500-ton vessel aroused little comment in the United States. On January 20 the press reported the breakdown of the German cruiser *Sperber* on its way to South America. The vessel put into Vigo for repairs and did not arrive at Willemstad until February 3.<sup>87</sup> The 1,100-ton *Sperber* was really a light-draft gunboat, useful for work in shallow coastal waters where heavy cruisers could not operate but otherwise of negligible fighting value. Little significance seems to have been attached to her arrival unless it might have been the occasion of Roosevelt's letter of February 5 to the Navy Department. The decision of the allied governments not to increase their naval representation to a greater extent may have been taken independently of the attitude of the United States; nevertheless it was a factor which could not be completely omitted from the calculations of these powers.

The administration had been somewhat perturbed a few days before this by a rumor that Germany intended to purchase the two battleships under construction for the Chilean navy in British shipyards. On January 30 the Chilean government put the vessels up for sale pursuant to the terms of the naval limitation agreement of May 28, 1902, with Argentina.<sup>88</sup> Roosevelt wrote at once to the Navy Department demanding information at the earliest possible date on the quality and condition of the Chilean battleships, and the Bureau of Navigation sent the facts to him the next day.<sup>89</sup> The naval attaché in London had been watching developments in connection with the sale since

<sup>84</sup> *Die Grosse Politik*, XVII, 259; *Boston Transcript*, Jan. 7, 1903.

<sup>85</sup> Report of Lt. Commander S. W. B. Diehl, Jan. 17, 1903, U. S. Dept. of State, Miscellaneous Letters, January, 1903.

<sup>86</sup> Colwell to Moody, Jan. 21, 1903, *ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> *Boston Transcript*, Jan. 20, 1903; Diehl to Moody, Feb. 8, 1903, U. S. Dept. of State, Miscellaneous Letters, February, 1903.

<sup>88</sup> *New York Herald*, Jan. 30, Feb. 1, 1903. Rumor of the impending sale had appeared Jan. 10. See *Boston Transcript* for that date.

<sup>89</sup> Cortelyou to Moody, Jan. 30, 1903, and Sigsbee to Moody, Jan. 31, 1903, Case 4924, Gen. Corresp., O.N.I.

the launching of the vessels on January 13 and 15. He informed the department that agents of the builders were eager to sell the ships to Germany but that the British government favored their acquisition by the United States in order to keep them out of the hands of a dangerous naval rival.<sup>90</sup> When the Germans showed no interest in the proposition, the agent of the Chilean government in London tried to high pressure the American embassy into buying the ships.<sup>91</sup> Neither Roosevelt nor the Navy Department wanted the vessels, which were not of a pattern to fit well into the American fleet, but the international situation was such that the administration could not ignore the implications involved in the sale of battleships to a potentially hostile power.<sup>92</sup> After the Venezuelan affair had been settled, no further interest was displayed in the matter; and on March 12 Hay instructed the embassy in London to that effect.<sup>93</sup>

Thus the Venezuelan crisis passed into history, not to be resurrected until circumstances were such that ex parte statements on the subject would be certain to be challenged in the absence of documentary proof. Failure to find corroborative testimony in the diplomatic documents or in the Roosevelt papers does not necessarily invalidate the Rough Rider's claim to having taken a hand personally in bringing the German government around to a more reasonable view of the situation.<sup>94</sup> If in later years Roosevelt fashioned a more dramatic account of his activities than is warranted by the data now available, there exists, at least, a substantial factual basis for his statements. The naval history of the period contains nothing to repudiate or make the Roosevelt story unlikely. Moreover, the naval records reveal a good deal of circumstantial evidence that fits well into the narrative. The key to the prob-

<sup>90</sup> Clover to Sigsbee, Jan. 20, Feb. 2, 1903, *ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> White to Hay, Feb. 2, Feb. 6, 1903, U. S. Dept. of State, Despatches, Great Britain, CCVI. The vessels were ultimately sold to Great Britain, which purchased them at a much reduced price once the international tension created by the Venezuelan affair had disappeared.

<sup>92</sup> Press speculation linked the disposal of the battleships closely with the Venezuelan negotiations. New York *Herald*, Feb. 10, 1903, said that the Navy Department, after considering the advisability of purchasing the Chilean ships, decided to take no action lest it be misconstrued as apprehension of approaching trouble and evidence that the Venezuelan situation was more disquieting to the United States than was really the case.

<sup>93</sup> Hay to Choate, Mar. 12, 1903, U. S. Dept. of State, Instructions, Great Britain, XXXIV, 363.

<sup>94</sup> Henry Adams, ed., *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary* (Washington, 1908), p. xix, explains the absence of any reference to the Venezuelan affair in the Hay papers by saying that Hay's rule in diplomacy "was to settle all questions, if possible, by word of mouth, and to write few papers." In 1916 Senator Lodge tried to check the Roosevelt story with the Navy Department but merely received in reply a copy of the official orders sent to Dewey on Nov. 18, 1902. Henry Cabot Lodge Papers. As the Roosevelt papers on this subject have been sifted so thoroughly by historians, the author has limited his use of source material largely to the Navy's parallel record for the period. Thomas A. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People* (2d ed., New York, 1942), p. 552, n. 9, cites evidence in the Roosevelt letters that the outlines of the story involving the ultimatum were in his mind before he left the presidency.

lem is the preparation made by the Navy in 1902 to defend the interests and security of the United States in the Caribbean. The plans drawn up by the naval authorities and put into operation during the December maneuvers afforded the President every opportunity to act as later he said he did. Roosevelt's imperfect recollection of these plans in the turmoil of 1916 would account for the inaccuracies in his narrative, which have misled his admirers and excited the scorn of his critics, although most of the details have been available to everyone since the Navy Department published its *Annual Reports* in 1902 and 1903. Not even the ultimatum to the German ambassador can be dogmatically dismissed for any of the historical or psychological reasons yet presented against it.

\* \* \* *Notes and Suggestions* \* \* \*

## Disposal of the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas at the Paris Peace Conference

RUSSELL H. FIFIELD\*

AT THE conclusion of the first World War the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas as possessions of Germany in the Pacific Ocean were subject to the disposition of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. The islands, extending about 1,300 miles from north to south and 2,700 miles from east to west, do not have the total area of Luxembourg, the smallest of the United Nations. In 1920, the year of the first Japanese census, the population of the islands was about 52,000 of which over 48,000 were natives. The economic significance of the islands was and is small, but the strategic value is very great. They have been compared to stationary aircraft carriers, cutting communications between Hawaii and the Philippines. In the last sixty years the flags of Spain, Germany, Japan, and the United States, representing Europe, Asia, and North America, have flown either over all of the islands or important groups of them. With the outbreak of the Pacific war and the Japanese use of the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas, it could be presumed that the future political status of the islands would be discussed during the peace negotiations.<sup>1</sup> The Charter of the United Nations, which was written before the territorial settlements in the Pacific were made, provides for strategic areas in the trusteeship agreements over trust territories.

American specialists at the Paris Peace Conference were aware of the strategic importance of the German islands in the Pacific Ocean. Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, specialist on the Far East and Pacific, believed that in an ideal solution all the islands would be placed under British or under American control. Realizing the impossibility of such a solution, he thought that the islands should be put at the disposal of the League of Nations, a solution which would place them either collectively or by groups under the administration of one or more powers as mandatories subject to certain limitations,

\* The author is a foreign service officer with the United States Department of State.

<sup>1</sup> George H. Blakeslee, "Japan's Mandated Islands," *Department of State Bulletin*, XI (Dec. 17, 1944), 764-65.



such as the maintenance of the Open Door and the prohibition of fortifications. Dr. Hornbeck believed that the islands could be used as a factor in the American negotiations with Japan and Great Britain.

Mr. E. T. Williams, another American specialist on the Far East and Pacific at the Paris Peace Conference, disagreed with some of the recommendations of Dr. Hornbeck. Mr. Williams thought that some power other than Japan or the United States, but trusted by both, should be made the mandatory, providing the principle of mandates was adopted. If the Japanese were installed in the German islands north of the equator, they would menace Hawaii and the Philippines. Since the Germans in the Pacific were far removed from their home base in Germany, they did not offer the threat of the Japanese.

Breckinridge Long, third assistant secretary of state, in a memorandum on December 14, 1918, to Mr. Leland Harrison, assistant secretary of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, recommended that some of the Pacific islands be returned to Germany and that after the Peace Conference, the United States acquire the Marianas, Carolines, and German Samoan Islands from the Reich. With the German islands north of the equator under permanent Japanese occupation, he believed that "it would be impossible to send any military forces to the Philippines with any safety if the convoy were directed through the usual channels."<sup>2</sup>

One copy of Mr. Long's letter went to Mr. E. T. Williams for Secretary of State Lansing and the other to Mr. Gordon Auchincloss for Colonel House. Mr. E. T. Williams, in a letter to Secretary Lansing commenting on Mr. Long's proposal, stated that Japan was an apt student of Prussia and was influenced by the same spirit and by a similar idea that she was summoned to world leadership. Mr. Williams opposed returning the islands to Germany and later buying them from the Reich. He believed that if the Americans and British stood together on the question Japan could do nothing since Germany and Russia could give her no aid. Mr. Williams thought that Japan wanted American friendship although the United States figured in all her calculations as her hypothetical enemy.

The opinion of George Louis Beer is interesting. He served as colonial expert on the American Commission of Inquiry and later as chief of the colonial section of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. He wrote for the Commission of Inquiry on the subject of the Marianas, Palaus, Caro-

<sup>2</sup> U. S. Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919: The Paris Peace Conference*, II (Washington, 1942), 512-15. Hereafter cited *Paris Peace Conference, 1919*.

lines, and Marshalls as follows: "These islands have been occupied by Japan since the autumn of 1914. They have but slight importance, except possibly from the strategic standpoint. . . . The United States has absolutely no legitimate right to these islands and to advance such a claim would not only be considered a gratuitous affront by Japan, but would undermine the moral influence of the United States in the settlement of other questions."<sup>3</sup>

American naval men were aware of the importance of the German islands in the Pacific. In an undated report signed by W. Evans, H. E. Yarnell, and Thomas C. Hart to Admiral William S. Benson, chief of naval operations, it was stated that leaving "the Carolines and Marshalls in the hands of the Japanese is opposed to the interests of the United States. Yet these islands cannot be taken from Japan and given to another nation without violating the principle of fair play and arousing the enmity of Japan. A possible solution might be to give Japan a free hand in Eastern Siberia." These men recommended that the Marshalls, Carolines, German New Guinea, and German Samoa be internationalized.<sup>4</sup>

On January 27, 1919, Baron Makino presented the Japanese claim before the Council of Ten for the "unconditional cession of . . . all of the Islands in German possession in the Pacific Ocean North of the Equator together with the rights and properties in connection therewith." He asserted that the inhabitants were "not in a position to organize themselves politically, economically, or socially in the modern sense" and that they were "fully contented under the present Regime [Japanese]." Baron Makino added that Japan was in "actual possession" and that Japanese public opinion was strong for the retention of the islands.<sup>5</sup> In a printed statement to newspaper correspondents, the Japanese spokesman declared that "we have entered a claim for the right to occupy those islands for the purpose of peaceful development, and certainly it would be our aim to educate and help the people. . . . To place these islands under the control of any other nation would naturally constitute a reflection upon Japan which would be resented by the people of that country."

The claim of Japan for the actual cession of the islands in 1919 went beyond the Japanese statement at the time of occupation in 1914. After a public statement in Tokyo on October 6, 1914, about the Japanese seizure of Jaluit Island in the Marshalls, the private secretary of the Japanese minister of marine told the American naval attaché that "he [the secretary] thought it

<sup>3</sup> George Louis Beer, *African Questions at the Paris Peace Conference* (New York, 1923), pp. 454-55.

<sup>4</sup> David Hunter Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris* (New York, 1924), II, 106-107.

<sup>5</sup> *Paris Peace Conference, 1919*, III (Washington, 1943), 738-40.

likely that [a] small force had been left on the island but that if there was any occupation it was temporary and for military purposes only.”<sup>6</sup> After the Japanese navy department announced that it had “taken possession of the islands strategically important among the Marianne, the Marshall, and the East and West Caroline Archipelagoes,”<sup>7</sup> the Japanese foreign office informally told newspapermen that the recent captures are “on the same basis as that of Jaluit Island.”<sup>8</sup> However, on December 10, Foreign Minister Kato in reply to a parliamentary interpellation asserted that “I definitely declare that I have never given any guarantee to the American Government,” *i.e.*, that the “action of Japan in Jaluit Island is a temporary measure taken for purely strategical purposes.”<sup>9</sup> Yet the official summary of the minister’s reply to the interpellation in the Diet read that “the occupation of the South Sea Islands was a military measure, and no diplomatic action in connection therewith has been taken. Just as in the case of Great Britain, so in the case of Japan the occupation of German territory is temporary, and its disposition will be decided at the peace conference.”<sup>10</sup>

On September 6, 1917, Viscount Ishii in a conversation with Secretary Lansing told about a meeting with Sir Edward Grey in London which occurred during Viscount Ishii’s return to Japan from France, where he had been ambassador in 1915. The Japanese statesman told Sir Edward Grey that “no Government in Japan could stand if they did not retain some of the South Sea Islands as ‘souvenirs’ of the war.” According to Viscount Ishii, Sir Edward Grey had “practically consented” that the German islands in the Pacific north of the equator should go to Japan while those south of the equator should go to Great Britain. Secretary Lansing replied to Viscount Ishii that “I was glad to know this and appreciated his frankness in telling me, but that I could make no comment on such an agreement at the present time.”<sup>11</sup>

Japan had diplomatically prepared the way for the acquisition of the islands before the opening of the Paris Peace Conference. She had acquired secret promises from Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy in the early months of 1917 to the effect that each would support her at the time of peace negotiations in demanding from Germany the cession of the German islands north of the equator in the Pacific as well as the cession of the territorial rights and special interests possessed by Germany in Shantung before the

<sup>6</sup> *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1914*, Supplement, p. 184.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 185.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 210.

<sup>11</sup> *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Lansing Papers, 1914-1920* (Washington, 1939), II, 433.

war. The British in assenting on February 16 asked Japan to support their claim to the German islands south of the equator, and this request was granted by Tokyo on February 21. The French in assenting on March 1 asked Japan to support a complete diplomatic break between China and Germany, and this request was approved by Japan on March 6. Italian assent was given by the minister of foreign affairs in an oral statement to the Japanese ambassador on March 28.

The disposal of the German possessions overseas including the Pacific islands was a highly controversial problem at the Paris Peace Conference. Four possible solutions existed: The possessions might be returned to Germany, or they might be internationalized; they might be annexed by the victorious powers as the spoils of battle, or they might become mandates entrusted to a mandatory state by the League of Nations. All the powers agreed that the overseas possessions of the Reich should not be restored. The real controversy was between the mandate idea and the claims for outright annexation. Prime Minister W. M. Hughes of Australia and Prime Minister W. F. Massey of New Zealand insisted that the German islands south of the equator should be annexed to Australia and to New Zealand, respectively. However, both men realized the military danger of the Japanese claim for the annexation of the German islands north of the equator.<sup>12</sup>

Japan did not contend for outright cession of the German islands as strenuously as Australia and New Zealand. The main Japanese effort at the Paris Peace Conference was directed toward the "unconditional cession of the leased territory of Kiaochow together with the railways, and other rights possessed by Germany in respect of Shantung Province."<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, Japan opposed the internationalization of the islands. When Dr. Takahashi, an authority on international law, questioned the Japanese prime minister concerning the value of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance if the German ports in the South Seas were placed under the international control of the League of Nations, the prime minister replied that he had heard nothing of international control by the League of Nations, but perhaps it was intended that one country would control the islands in the name of the League. Since the leading opposition to the solution of the Shantung issue favorable to Japan came from President Wilson, the Japanese were apparently prepared to soften their claim for outright cession of the German islands north of the equator and to accept the mandate idea. Furthermore, the Japanese not only ceased to press their claims for racial equality but also they presumably

<sup>12</sup> Miller, XX, 314.

<sup>13</sup> *Paris Peace Conference, 1919*, III, 738.

decided to enter the League of Nations when the Shantung question was settled satisfactorily to Tokyo.

At a meeting of the Council of Three, consisting of Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau, on April 21, 1919, President Wilson reported a recent conversation with Baron Makino and Count Chinda in which the President had made the suggestion of Secretary Lansing "that all claims in the Pacific should be ceded to the Allied and Associated Powers as trustees leaving them to make fair and just dispositions." He reminded the Japanese that under the plans they would have a mandate of the islands in the north Pacific. He said that he had made a reservation in the case of the island of Yap, which he believed should be international. During a session of the Council of Three the next day at 11:30 A.M. with Baron Makino present, President Wilson expressed annoyance at the secret promises already made between the Allies relative to the Pacific islands. The President asserted that his colleagues in the council were both bound by secret agreements, although perhaps "he might be entitled to question whether Great Britain and Japan had been justified in handing round the islands in the Pacific."<sup>14</sup> At the afternoon session of the "Big Three," Lloyd George stated that because of the "very formidable" submarine campaign of the Germans and the shortage of torpedo-boat destroyers in the Mediterranean, the Japanese had asked for the "arrangement" in exchange for naval help. "We had been hard pressed," he said, "and had agreed."<sup>15</sup>

On April 30, Secretary Lansing at the Council of Foreign Ministers raised a question concerning the desirability of Yap's being internationalized and administered by an international commission in control of the cable lines. Baron Makino replied that Yap was occupied by Japan and that "he regarded the suggestion as a very grave matter." He believed that the question of the status of the island should be settled before deciding the question of cable control. Secretary Lansing gave warning that he would propose the matter for discussion at a later time and that Yap might be a special case.<sup>16</sup>

On May 1, at a meeting of the "Big Three," President Wilson stated that a "tacit agreement" existed as to the assignment of the mandates. Four days later Lloyd George at the Council of Three expressed himself as eager to announce the mandates to the public when the peace treaty was issued. President Wilson replied that he wanted to prevent the appearance of a

<sup>14</sup> Minutes of Council, Archives of Department of State, as quoted in E. T. Williams, "Japan's Mandate in the Pacific," *American Journal of International Law*, XXVII (July, 1933), 430.

<sup>15</sup> As quoted in *ibid.*, XXVII, 431.

<sup>16</sup> *Paris Peace Conference, 1919*, IV (Washington, 1943), 653-54.

division of the spoils accompanying the peace treaty. The next day Lloyd George at a meeting of the Council of Three read the list of those mandates and mandates that had been settled by that time. He asserted that Japan could receive a mandate for certain Pacific islands north of the equator. A formal decision was made on May 7, and the minutes read "without any qualification"<sup>17</sup> that the Japanese were to have a mandate over the German islands in the Pacific north of the equator. Since the Treaty of Versailles was not signed until June 28, this decision was "a preliminary and conditional commitment."<sup>18</sup>

President Wilson did not attempt to acquire the Marianas, Marshalls, and Carolines for the United States at the Paris Peace Conference, despite the interests of American missionaries in the area and the strategic location of the islands lying between Hawaii and the Philippines. He not only opposed any territorial expansion of the United States but he was known also to favor American withdrawal from the Philippine Islands. On the other hand, President Wilson opposed granting a mandate of the islands to Japan, but he believed that the United States could not prevent it. He was decidedly against the use of the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas as Japanese naval bases. The islands were finally placed under the administration of Japan as a "C" mandate. They should be governed "as an integral portion of the Empire of Japan" but annual reports should be made to the council of the League of Nations and the welfare of the natives should be safeguarded. Japan agreed that "no military or naval bases shall be established or fortifications erected in the territory." The American Senate did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles, but on February 11, 1922, the United States signed a convention with Japan relative to the status of Yap and the Japanese mandate.<sup>19</sup> This convention included the terms of the mandate which had been decided at the Paris Peace Conference.

The Japanese viewed and used their Pacific mandate rather ironically. Tadao Yanaihara, a former professor of economics at Tokyo Imperial University, wrote for the Institute of Pacific Relations in the middle 1930's, "That the mandate system is politically a new form of territorial distribution among imperialistic powers is made fully evident in the class 'C' mandates."<sup>20</sup> Although Japan withdrew from the League of Nations following the Manchurian controversy, the mandate system was retained in theory but exploited in practice. The apprehension of some Americans about the fortifica-

<sup>17</sup> Blakeslee, in *Department of State Bull.*, XI, 767.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 766.

<sup>19</sup> U. S. Department of State, *Treaty Series*, No. 664.

<sup>20</sup> Tadao Yanaihara, *Pacific Islands under Japanese Mandate* (New York, 1940), p. 23.



tion of the islands by the Japanese and about the strategic value of the mandate in military operations increased with the tension in the Pacific. In the years that preceded Pearl Harbor foreigners had more and more difficulty in visiting the islands. Under the mandate system the annual reports to the council of the League of Nations were prepared by the mandatory power. The Japanese made extensive harbor improvements on some of the islands, especially Saipan in the Marianas. Truk, in the Carolines, became the leading Japanese naval base in the South Pacific, serving as the hub of a concentric system of island bases.

The Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, was facilitated by the control of the mandated islands north of the equator. Guam, the only American island in the Marianas, was taken on December 12. The American island of Wake within easy reach of the Japanese fell on December 22. The location of the fortified mandated islands prevented substantial American aid from reaching the Philippines and speeded the conquest of the archipelago by the forces of the Rising Sun. On the other hand, the Japanese mandate played an important role in the defeat of the empire. Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz advanced across the central Pacific, acquiring staging bases, neutralizing and by-passing islands, and destroying the vital sea communications of the Japanese. Kwajalein and Eniwetok in the Marshalls were seized in February, 1944; Saipan, Guam, and Tinian in the Marianas were taken in the summer; four of the Palaus in the Carolines were captured by October 1. Islands like Truk, Kusaie, and Ponape were neutralized and by-passed. The Marianas were made into bases for the devastating raids of the super-fortresses on the homeland of Japan. The American conquest of the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa was facilitated by the positions won from the Japanese in the mandated islands.

Although Japan surrendered before an invasion of the mainland was necessary, the road to victory in the Pacific was costly. Looking at the accounts of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, the student of diplomatic history learns that the fears of some of the American experts about the Japanese use of the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas were realized in the events of the Pacific war.

## Zachary Taylor on Jackson and the Military Establishment, 1835

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.\*

A RECENT biographer of Zachary Taylor, discussing the period during which he was in command at Fort Crawford, Prairie du Chien, Michigan Territory, says that "he had been favorably disposed toward the Jackson Administration early in 1829 but now vehemently sympathized with the opposition."<sup>1</sup> The latter part of this statement is fully documented by a letter from Taylor to John J. Crittenden,<sup>2</sup> dated at Fort Crawford, November 17, 1835. The original letter, filling six pages, is among the miscellaneous collections of the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, and has not been published previously.

The entire statement is interesting for its light on the state of public affairs and military matters in the 1830's and on Zachary Taylor's views on Jackson, Cass, and Van Buren before he himself became a national figure. A general in the field who wrote such a letter today would spend the rest of his military career hoping that the discretion of the recipient would consign its text to the archives to be found, like this one, over a century later.

FORT CRAWFORD PRAIRIE DU CHIEN  
MICHIGAN TERRITORY November 17th 1835

DEAR SIR,

In consequence of a number of remarks made during the last session of Congress, by different members of the house of representatives, in relation to the officers of the Army, when the bill for equalising their pay, & those of the officers of the Navy, or rather for increasing the pay of the latter, was under discussion, particularly by the honl. Mr. Mann a member from New York,<sup>3</sup> as well as several resolutions introduced by him, which resolutions met my approbation, at any rate, so far as related to doing away the office of general in chief, or major general commanding the Army, has induced me, althoug[h] I have not the honor of a personal acquaintance with Mr. M., to communicate with, & give him my views

\*The editor is assistant director of the Maryland Historical Society.

<sup>1</sup> Holman Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor, Soldier of the Republic* (Indianapolis, 1941), p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> John Jordan Crittenden (1787-1863), of Kentucky, serving the second of four nonconsecutive terms in the United States Senate, 1835-41.

<sup>3</sup> Abijah Mann, jr. (1793-1868), member of Congress from New York, 1833-37.

in favour of a reorganization of our military establishment, recommending a change of the present mode of compensating the officers, as well as several other matters connected with the same; all or the greater portion of which, will I presume be brought before the house, of which he was, & still is a member, at the approaching session. Under which expectation I have taken the liberty of forwarding to you, a copy of my communication to him, with a request, should you coincide with me, in any of the opinions therein contained, that you will give them such support as you may consider they are entitled to, should the whole or any portion of those subjects, be brought before the Senate.

Judging from the manner our national affairs have been managed for the last two or three years, without any prospect or even hope of a change for the better, I consider it not at all improbable, but a great struggle will take place, & at no distant day throughout the country, in which I fear the sword will decide, whether the constitution, or the will of the chief magistrate of the nation, is to be the supreme law of the land; In which event the army, small as it is, will be of much greater importance to which ever side it espouses, than is general[ly] supposed; and there is not a doubt in my mind, but a large portion of the officers attached to it, particularly of the higher grades, & the whole of the rank & file, in that case, would be found arrayed on the side of the latter. It therefore appears to me, that it would be good policy, on the part of those in favour of the constitution & laws, as heretofore interpreted & administered, to cut down the military establishment, as far as they could do so, to the smallest number possible, consistent with the wants of the country. And after duly considering the subject, I am clearly of the opinion, that 5,000 rank & file, appropriately officer[ed], would be ample for every purpose or contingency, during peace, as well as to add to or build on, in the event of war, which from present appearances, is not likely soon to occur on land, unless among ourselves, in which case, it strikes me, the fewer regular troops we have the better. The for[e]going considerations among others, induced me to transmit to Mr. Man[n], the communication in question, under the impression that the irregularities & abuses, pointed out could be much more readily corrected, if measures for doing so, were brought forward & supported, by those who sustained, instead of the opponents of the measures of the administration.

After the statements made in the Senate by Mr. Clay & Mr. Calhoun, as well as othe[r] distinguished individuals of that body, when in debate, in relation to certain acts of the presidents, which were, that "reform or revolution must be the inevitable consequence of his course if persevered in"; Entertaining such opinions, in which no doubt they were sincere, I was not a little surprised, at their contributing by their votes, to augment the military establishment of the country, by creating an ordnance corps or department, & raising a regiment of dragoons; neither of which in my humble opinion was wanting, or was at all necessary, for the public service; as by so doing they aided in strengthening the executive department, physically, as well as by increasing the patronage of the same; which appears to me under all the circumstances of the case, would have been better, had they opposed such augmentation to the utmost; at any rate, after making the statements refer[r]ed to; This too during a state of profound peace, with the exception of some little difficulties of minor importance, with our Indian neighbours, brought about by the imbecility of the secretary of war, & the general at the head of the Army.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Clay also stated in the Senate at, I think, the session before the last,

<sup>4</sup> Lewis Cass (1782-1866), of Michigan, was Secretary of War from 1831 to 1836. Maj. Gen. Alexander Macomb (1782-1841) was commanding general of the United States Army from 1828 to his death thirteen years later.

when animadverting on some acts of the chief magistrates, that he "consider[e]d the army sound to the core"; which statement I do not believe he would now make, or would have done, since the proceedings of the court of inquiry were promulgated or made known, in the case of Lt. Lane, in consequence of his attack on Mr Ewing a member of the house of representatives from Indiana;<sup>5</sup> which court was composed of three general officers; as their proceedings & opinions, in regard to the same, to my mind evidently were made up & given, principally with the view & intention, of pleasing the incumbent of the white house. The merits of the case it seems to me, were in a great measure, if not entirely lost sight of, or overlooked by the court; and I have not a doubt had Lt. L— assaulted any other member of the opposition, under the same or any other circumstances, he would have been protected, if not justified, by said court, for fear had they done otherwise of the presidents displeasure. It is therefore time for such members as do not support the measures of the administration to be looking about them, at any rate they should be at all times prepared, to protect themselves from similar outrages —

Besides should Mr. Van Buren succeed the present chief magistrate, which I greatly fear will be the case, it is quite likely there will not be another election directly by the people at large; as he will appoint his successor, who will be brought into that office, by the same influence & means, used to secure to him the succession; & which will likely continue to be the case, until there is a great revolution of some kind or description, throughout the nation, which may not be a bloodless one; as he Mr. V— will mainly owe his success, to the expressed wishes, influence & exertions of the present chief magistrate in his favour, aided by the whole patronage of the government; As I truly & sincerely believe, every department of which, is now managed, more with a view to that object, than for the good of the country; at least such being the case as relates to the war department; the foregoing state of things, being fully carried out by the head of the same, from the commanding genl. down to the situation of sutlers. Individuals who had filled the latter situations, for many years, possessing character, as well as capital, who gave perfect satisfaction to both officers & soldiers, for whose accommodation they ought to be appointed, and against whom no complaints were ever made, so far as related to the manner they discharged their duties, have been turned out of those petty offices, by the war minister, to make way for political partisans, who have neither credit, capital or character, to recommend them; and who are thus rewarded, for abusing those that have, at any rate the latter, because they would not right or wrong, hurrah for the present chief magistrate, & the would be heir to his office. In some instances as those individuals cannot procure the necessary supplies for the troops they are appointed to suttle for; in which case they farm out the privi-

<sup>5</sup> John Ewing (1789–1858), member of Congress from Indiana, 1833–35, 1837–39. On the evening of February 26, 1835, while Ewing was walking to his boardinghouse after adjournment, he was attacked by John F. Lane, a lieutenant in the Army and son of Amos Lane, member of Congress from Indiana. A blow from an iron cane with a leaden head was Ewing's first notice of the affair, and before he could defend himself, there were several other violent blows which disabled him temporarily. Ewing, in a letter to the Speaker of the House apologizing for his absence from his seat, said he supposed the cause for the assault was a heated discussion with the elder Lane in a debate on the floor of the House several weeks before. Gales and Seaton, *Register of Debates in Congress*, XI, 1565–66. A select committee of seven was appointed by the House to investigate the assault on Mr. Ewing. Hearings were conducted in the presence of Lt. Lane, who was allowed to cross-examine witnesses and to introduce testimony. Witnesses revealed that Ewing had a sword cane and drew it, but was parried by Lane, and that Lane grabbed Ewing by the hair before administering the second and successive blows. Dr. John B. Blake testified that Ewing's wounds were severe, including cuts on his forehead and cheek and a swollen forefinger. No cause for the attack, other than Ewing's original supposition, was developed by the committee. *House Reports of Committees*, 23 Congress, 2 session, No. 135, Feb. 28, 1835.

lege, in some cases for twelve or fifteen hundred dollars *pr. annum*, which is an indirect tax, on the officers & soldiers, & reside where ever it suits their inclinations or convenience, generally where they can be most conspicuous at elections in favour of the powers that be; One of those gentry who was forced on this command (who died a short time since) took up his residence in Philadelphia, & devoted himself to politics (after farming out his right to suttle for fifteen hundred dollars) in support of course of all, & every act of the administration, & was quite conspicuous, so far as making a great noise would render him so, against the recharter of the U.S. Bank, as well as in favour of a removal of the deposits from the same. During the excitement on those subjects, he was quite active in getting subscribers to a memorial, to be laid before congress approving the cours[e] of the president, on those & no doubt, every other occasion, as well as to shew that said measures, had not been the cause of producing any distress among the market. Which memorial, he was deputed to carry to Washington, & lay before Congress then in session, & the president; at which time, he could not on his debts, have paid a cent on the dollar, nor independent of his pension (raised from the troops) could he have gotten credit for a meals victuals, where he was known. Another individual of pretty much the same character & description, a certain Mr. Stambaugh, who was twice rejected I think by the Senate, as an Indian agent, has recently been appointed by the Secretary of War, as sutler to that portion of this regiment, stationed at the mouth of the St. Peters river, near the Falls of St. Anthony; which appointment was doubtless given to reward him for his zeal & services in the good cause; after it was found the Senate would not confirm his nomination, to any situation that required their sanction; which was done I may say at the expense of the command at that remote station; as by so doing they displaced the best sutler I have ever known attached to any portion of the Army, since I joined it. Mr. S— I learn from good authority, is in close correspondence with the honl secretary, & I make no doubt is authorised or directed by him, to report on the character of the officers, at any rate so far as relates to their political opinions; If so it is to me a perfect matter of indiff[erence]; for I have & will continue to express my opinion of public men & measures, as I conceive they merit, let the consequences be what they may; even should it be the cause of my being reformed; which if done, would give me but little concern, under the present management of the military establishment. I look on Mr Stambaugh & Mr Cass, pretty much in the same light, & consider them fit associates & correspondents, worthy of each other; and consider the president most fortunate in the selection of his War Minister (who was no doubt recommended to him for that office by Mr V. Buren) as he could not in my opinion have found an individual in the country, who would have been more compliant in conforming to his wishes, or more zealous in carrying out his principles, & executing his plans for the elevation of his favourite; for I do not believe he possesses one particle of firmness, independence, political or moral honesty; and is therefore qualified to act “well any part,” that may be assigned him, particularly as he can do so, under the mask & appearance, of great forbearance, humility, temperance & perhaps religion also. I make no doubt by observing his acts closely for a short time, we shall not differ widely in our opinions as to his character.

I do not know whether your friends ought to rejoice or regret most, your going into the councils of the nation at this time, as matters & things, as regards the government of the same, appears to me to be disjointed & very much out of sorts, & the temper of the people in every section of the country, from Maine to Louisiana, appears to be in a state of great excitability, never before witnessed,

at least since my recollection; how & when all this is to end, it is impossible to foresee; time alone will shew -

I am well aware you can, & ought not to carry into the Senate, any feelings of respect, personal or political, towards the present chief magistrate, as it is impossible that you can approve many of his acts, which we must consider "errors of the heart, & not of the head," at any rate his removing individuals from office, on account of their political opinions, or rather to make way or provide for his own, & the creatures of Mr. V- Buren; In fact carrying out as far as he could well do so, the Spoils System of the New York politicians. At the same time, I know you possess too much magnanimity, prudence & good sense, to oppose all his measures on party principles; as I feel confident you will give to every thing of the kind, coming from that quarter, the proper considerations, & will then act in regard to them, for the good of the country; In fact I consider it would be well during such a state of things as exist at present, rather to yield somewhat as regards our opinions until the minds of the people had become more composed, & our institutions brought back to their former state of order &c, than to be too tenacious in our opposition to matters of minor importance. It seem[s] to me that the friends of the Constitution & laws, in the Senate, have rather injured the cause, in some instances, by carrying their opposition too far, as for example in rejecting the nominations of Mr. V- Buren & Mr. Stephenson, as Ministers to England -

But I may be obtruding on you my opinions & advice beyond what I am warranted from our acquaintance in doing, particularly on subjects that you are so much more capable of deciding on, than I can possibly be; but flatter myself you will attribute the liberty I have taken in doing so, to the interest I take in every thing that concerns your well doing, as I feel confident you have but few if any friend (if I may be permitted to use that term) who feels greater solicitude for your prosperity, & advancement than myself.

I greatly fear that I have drawn too largely on your time as well as patience, in troubling you with this long & I fear uninteresting letter, as well as the copy of the communication to Mr M---, but you can lay them aside until you are perfectly at leisure to glance them over, if not altogether. Nor do I wish you to give yourself the least trouble, as regards any matter embraced in the letter, unless brought before the Senate in some shape or other form from the house of representatives, or in some other way -

I may have taken up erroneous impressions in relation to the state of the country, as well as the management of our National affairs, but have come to the foregoing conclusions from my personal knowledge as to the management of the military establishment; and from the public journals or news papers, in relation to the management of the other departments of the government. Great allowances however should be made in regard to my opinions on the subjects in question, as I have been constantly on duty, at a remote & frontier station in the Indian country, for near four years without leaving the same but once, & then only for sixty days, on leave of absence.

With considerations of great respect & esteem I remain

Truly your Friend

Z- TAYLOR

Honl. J. J. Crittenden

U. S. Senator from Ky.

PS As I have taken the liberty of refer[r]ing to the opinions & acts of Mr Calhoun, when secretary of war on several occasions, in the document transmitted to Mr Mann, I should be pleased if perfectly convenie[n]t, & proper, if you would submit the copy in your possession to him.



\* \* \* \* *Reviews of Books* \* \* \* \*

## General History

A HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY AND ITS CONNECTION WITH POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. By *Bertrand Russell*. (New York: Simon and Schuster. 1945. Pp. xxiii, 895. \$5.00.)

IN his preface the author states the purpose of this volume as follows: "My purpose is to exhibit philosophy as an integral part of social and political life: not as the isolated speculations of remarkable individuals, but as both an effect and a cause of the various communities in which different systems flourished. This purpose demands more account of general history than is usually given by historians of philosophy" (p. ix).

It cannot be said that this purpose is effectively carried out. It is true that a good many pages are devoted to general history, or to generalizations about it and about social and political conditions in the periods covered. But in the first place, these accounts are unequally distributed: they are considerable in length for the first period, Greco-Roman antiquity; they make up a very large proportion of the pages devoted to the medieval period, so large indeed that medieval philosophy is treated rather sketchily; but in the modern period, and progressively as the present is approached, there is little about social and political life. Presumably the author would defend this distribution on the ground that modern readers know more about modern society and politics than they know about the Middle Ages. But it is unlikely that modern readers understand how philosophy is an integral part of the society they live in, and certainly it cannot be supposed that modern philosophers are in fact less dependent on society than Plato or Thomas Aquinas. In the second place—and this is a more serious criticism—the accounts of general history do not contribute much to an understanding of the philosophy or the author's comments on it. The historical accounts are for the most part quite distinct from the exposition and criticism of the philosophies. Possibly these philosophies really were the speculations of remarkable individuals; at any rate, it is only in the vaguest sense that the author exhibits them as an integral part of social and political life.

This result is not an accident. It is inherent in Russell's conception of philosophy and his interest in it. He defines philosophy as an intermediate ground between science, to which belongs all definitely ascertainable truth whether arrived

at by deduction or induction, and mere dogmatic speculation which belongs to theology (p. xiii). This middle ground is very large and it contains many kinds of subject matter. Some problems turn out to be merely verbal and disappear with the progress of semantics. Some are real problems, and of these a part may possibly be solved with enough definiteness to be turned over to science, while another part remains philosophical and hence only the object of interesting but ideally undogmatic speculation. Russell's avowed interest lies almost wholly in distinguishing, wherever possible, the elements of truth or probable truth that can be recovered from speculation. In particular, he is the complete intellectualist: values are for him not capable of any scientific support, and "philosophy, throughout its history, has consisted of two parts inharmoniously blended: on the one hand a theory as to the nature of the world, on the other an ethical or political doctrine as to the best way of living" (p. 834). But is it not true that philosophies have always been an integral part of society only because they were speculations about a way of living? Quite possibly Russell is right in his conclusion, but it is not a recipe that produces "the sympathetic comprehension of philosophers" at which his book professes to aim.

Indeed the aim of the book is so remote from his dominant interest in the subject and his interest is so little compatible with sympathetic historical understanding that one wonders why he should have been willing to undergo the vast labor of producing a book so comprehensive. In respect to this question one can only speculate. It is tempting to regard the book as itself an integral part of the society in which it was produced and to guess that the author's interest is compounded of two parts perhaps inharmoniously blended. Beside Russell's intellectual interest in the abstract problems of a logical and cosmic philosophy there is a deep distress occasioned by human suffering and some strong convictions about the best way of living. And though no speculative justification of the latter appears to him to be forthcoming, there is a deep-seated feeling that intelligence ought to be able to say something significant about them.

*Cornell University*

GEORGE H. SABINE

THE LIBERAL TRADITION: A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL AND SPIRITUAL CONDITIONS OF FREEDOM. By *William Aylott Orton*. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 317. \$3.50.)

SOME thirteen years ago in a supercilious little book called *America in Search of Culture* Mr. W. A. Orton disparagingly compared "our modern concept of liberty" with the fascist and communist ideal of freedom, which is "order" or "fitting without strain into a comprehensive social pattern" (pp. 69-73). One tends to doubt whether a man who so recently defined freedom in terms equally applicable to the Third Reich and a well-run home for the feeble-minded has the temperamental equipment to produce a satisfactory work on the "liberal tradition." Mr. Orton has changed his opinion about freedom, which according to his

later revelation is "an active full-blooded personal liberty"; but it is easier for a grown-up man to change his opinions than to change his mind, and the kind of mind Mr. Orton has does not accommodate itself to an objective study of liberalism.

Not that his essay is devoid of merit. Many of Mr. Orton's dicta are sharp and to the point. His critiques of the intellectual arrogance of the several species of positivist, of the deficiencies of the political economists, and of the misdirected idealism of American thought on foreign affairs are neat if not particularly new. But in what primarily interests historians, his account of the liberal tradition, he does tricks with the past repugnant to anyone who feels that history is no easy bought mistress bound to suit her ways to the intellectual appetites of the current customer.

Mr. Orton employs the techniques not of a historian but of an astute pamphleteer. To prove that Calvinism (he does not like it) strengthened tendencies toward narrow patriotism he calls to witness the deeds of "that small-town Presbyterian," Woodrow Wilson, logic which is about on a par with proving the same thing about Catholicism by pointing to the deeds of that small-town Catholic, Adolf Hitler. This is the technique of the irrelevant example. Mr. Orton also uses the technique of selective chronology. To admit that Puritanism had anything to do with the liberties of Englishmen does not accord with his feelings for Catholicism and the Middle Ages (he loves them both dearly), so he derives English liberties in a smooth straight line from "Anglo-Saxon tradition" and feudalism. He does not indicate that similar traditions prevailed throughout medieval Europe and were toppled like ninepins in the sixteenth century. He does not suggest that English liberties might have suffered a similar fate had not the backs of their champions been starched with a stiff jolt of Puritanism. Yet after all the defendant in the case of ship money was Mr. John Hampden, who was not very Anglo-Saxon or very feudal, and was not at all Catholic.

Intent on bringing off a wedding between liberalism and the Catholic church, Mr. Orton recognizes the need of explaining away the hostile relations that in the past existed between the two parties. By the technique of selective chronology he lightly skips over almost everything that happened from the Reformation to 1864, although during those three centuries relations between the proponents of "an active full-blooded personal liberty" and the post-Tridentine church were not always entirely amicable. As for Pius IX's *Syllabus of Errors* and its condemnation of liberalism and liberty, Mr. Orton says charitably that "even popes fight with what apparatus and what vision they have." Charity is a noble thing, but it cannot have been too hard for a Catholic to find charity in his heart for a sore-beset pope. Mr. Orton shows no such charity toward Bentham, Ricardo, and the elder Mill, who with what vision they had fought for liberalism instead of against it. This is the technique of differential charity, and the frequency and the tendency with which the author employs the technique make him equally suspect as a historian and an expositor of liberalism.

On Mr. Orton's conclusion and fundamental thesis—that liberalism must reintegrate with Catholicism to save itself and Western culture from disaster—the reviewer need not comment. He is absolved from that duty by the author's peculiar methods. As Mr. Orton himself insists, one cannot separate ends from means nor, we may add, conclusions from the methods used to reach them. The author sets out to prove something about the liberal tradition by means of an investigation of its history. The proof can be no better than the history, and that is pretty bad. At best one may dismiss the case without prejudice, pending a presentation of the relevant evidence.

*Queens College*

J. H. HEXTER

BOUNDARY-MAKING: A HANDBOOK FOR STATESMEN, TREATY EDITORS, AND BOUNDARY COMMISSIONERS. By *Stephen B. Jones*, Associate Professor of Geography, University of Hawaii, Research Associate, Yale Institute of International Studies. With a Foreword by S. Whittemore Boggs, Chief of the Division of Geography and Cartography, Department of State. [Monograph Series of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law, No. 8.] (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1945. Pp. xv, 268. \$3.00.)

SOONER or later all political boundaries must be marked on the ground. Keenly realizing this all-important fact, Professor Jones takes as his theme the essential need of an intimate knowledge of the actual terrain upon which the boundary is to be placed. The obviousness of this is so clear that it would seem hardly necessary to elaborate upon it. Nevertheless, this small handbook of less than 270 pages marshals with devastating evidence and in a beautifully systematic manner the pitfalls which beset statesmen when they ignore the necessity of actual field observation.

Realizing of course that statesmen defining boundaries cannot examine the terrain themselves, the author emphasizes the need of delegating sufficient authority to boundary commissions to enable them to adjust the boundary to the peculiar local situations which are discovered on the ground and to meet the exigencies which arise from the fact that boundary makers sitting around a table unwittingly make use of their imagination of what the field conditions are, often with no real knowledge of either the geographic or the human factors involved. Nature is far more complex than man's imaginings.

It should be pretty clear to a statesman, by merely glancing through this book, that boundary delimitation, the indoor job, should go hand in hand with boundary demarcation, the outdoor job which calls into play a full understanding of the geomorphic peculiarities of a region. Among the many facets of the problem, we find discussed here types of boundaries, such as "natural" and "artificial" boundaries, mountain boundaries, water-parting boundaries, river boundaries, other

water boundaries, geometrical boundaries, nationality boundaries, language boundaries, resource boundaries, and others—all with their own peculiar and never completely surmountable problems.

The essence of the book, contained in Part I—some fifty-four pages which could well be required reading for all boundary makers—is summed up by the statements that (1) "Boundary geography is not a science of lines, but a science of regions"; (2) "Each boundary is essentially a unique case"; and (3) "Exact information about the borderland should be obtained in the field, by direct observation."

Part II, of some one hundred pages, elaborates upon Part I. Part III, "For Demarcation Commissions," should be perhaps even more useful to those who delimit boundaries in the office, by acquainting them with the problems with which those who actually demark the boundaries in the field will have to contend.

*Columbia University*

A. K. LOBECK

AGAINST THESE THREE: A BIOGRAPHY OF PAUL KRUGER, CECIL RHODES, AND LOBENGULA, LAST KING OF THE MATABELE.  
By *Stuart Cloete*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1945. Pp. viii, 472. \$3.50.)

WITH three historical novels of his native South Africa to his credit, Stuart Cloete is well qualified by ancestry, experience, and literary skill to write the imaginative biographies of the three men described in this interesting book. The author indeed is no Plutarch; and each of his "Big Three" had feet of clay—the pig-headed president of the Transvaal republic, Rhodes the ruthless imperialist, and the tragic Kaffir priest-king who died of smallpox, perhaps luckily, after the Matabele War of 1893, in which Dr. Jameson conquered Lobengula's warlike but ill-armed impis with negligible casualties and appalling bloodshed.

Described as a tall mountain of black flesh, naked but for his headring and a parakeet feather, a sporran of blue monkey skin about his loins, Lobengula (1870–1894) grew gouty on the white men's champagne and brandy, while condemning to death a man who drank the king's beer. Then, too, he had no more use for gold and diamonds than to wallow in them naked. True, he was the last great native ruler to stand against and finally fight the white man; but time (which disposed also of Oom Paul, who always believed the world was flat, and Rhodes) made Loben's fate inevitable. Mr. Cloete, however, does not omit the disgraceful details of the Matabele War. "Poetry, romance, justice and paradox are all true history," he tells us. And, while narrating certain picturesque German atrocities against the Hereros (which are tied in, through Goering's father, with the rise of Hitlerism), he notes also that, in 1935–36, when the movie of Rhodes was shown in London, the slaughter of the Matabele was deleted because of the

horror felt by the English people at the war methods used by the Italians in Abyssinia!

As to Rhodes versus Kruger, although not obtruded, the author's sympathies seem to lie with the Dutch "democrat," rather than the ruthless *realpolitiker* who bought power with diamonds and gold, "a British version of Spengler's Nordic superman—prototype of worse men to come." For Rhodes was the first man to organize business politically; his diamond industry was the first cartel; he promoted propaganda wholesale and dreamed of an "elite . . . that ruled whole continents by money; and assumed his name would live . . . for forty centuries."

This thesis, from Rhodes to Hitler, is developed here in a way the reviewer finds impressive but not entirely convincing. In his opinion Mrs. Millin, Cloete's main authority on Rhodes, is not always to be relied upon. In any case it is impossible to check; since, while giving four books as main sources, an incomplete list of other secondary authorities, a chronological table, and a historical survey condensed from Langer's version of Ploetz, *Against These Three* omits all specific references.

This is not to condemn a book which is vivid, dramatic, interesting, full of revealing detail, and eminently readable. It is not definitive history or biography and does not pretend to be; it does include much authentic material presented with wisdom and judgment. Tragedy is the keynote, yet touches of refreshing humor are not lacking, such as the following comments on the Jameson Raid "which ran the gamut from a Guy Fawkes plot to an Australian Bushrangers' holdup." The fiasco (as Rhodes called it) was due chiefly to "the hard-headed, practical business-men who organized the Johannesburg revolution," tycoons of goldmining and high finance whom the American John Hays Hammond naively calls "Fascist rather than Bolshevik . . . successful, conservative, moneyed; and not hot-headed irresponsible radicals." But Dr. Jim capped the (capitalist) anticlimax, ruined Rhodes, and sowed the seeds of the South African War, because "infected by Rhodes's passion for that noblest work of God, the-English gentleman, he apparently chose for his subordinates men who, though well bred, were all but mentally defective."

Joseph Chamberlain's part in the whole business is passed over, unfortunately; and when the author indulges (a little à la Guedalla) in philosophy and prophecy, he seems to flounder at times. But his speculations and reflections are worth pondering; and the general reader will certainly be intrigued. He may even be encouraged to interest himself further in a picturesque and lively land, whose complicated history and unsolved racial problems still await scientific study and scholarly elucidation.

Willamette University

R. I. LOVELL



## Ancient and Medieval History

THE EXCAVATIONS AT DURA-EUROPOS CONDUCTED BY YALE UNIVERSITY AND THE FRENCH ACADEMY OF INSCRIPTIONS AND LETTERS: PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE NINTH SEASON OF WORK, 1935-1936. Edited by *M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, F. E. Brown, and C. B. Welles*. Part I, THE AGORA AND BAZAAR. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1944. Pp. xiv, 270, plates. \$5.00.)

PREVIOUS volumes of this magnificent work are reviewed in the *American Historical Review*, XXXV (1930), 318; XXXVI (1931), 790; XXXVIII (1932), 145; XL (1935), 769; XLII (1937), 720; XLVI (1940), 104. The present installment fully maintains the high standard set by Rostovtzeff and all his fellow workers, a splendid team of collaborators who nevertheless remain individual. Here F. E. Brown is the principal contributor. With infinite patience in detailed observation and inference he has reconstructed the two stages of the market place of Dura, the Pompeii of the Euphrates. The first stage is that of the Hellenistic agora, with its symmetrical shop blocks; the second is that which resulted from a gradual transformation into a bazaar, with residences attached to shops and irregular alleys violating the beautiful simplicity of the original plan. We have here a parable of later developments in this part of the Hellenistic world: the neat classical Seleucid type with a Greek gabled roof in "a city of flat roofs in a world of flat roofs" (p. 20), the Neo-Babylonian bricks, and the incompleteness, together with a concentration on business and public life followed later by the process of individual encroachment, to which Greek public domains were earlier subject. Even to the last Dura kept something of its early aspect; the Near East was less Oriental then than it is today (*cf.* M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [Oxford, 1941], pp. 104 ff., 1051).

The hand of Rome is seen in a structure of a small provincial forum, the dimensions of which show the Roman foot (p. 64). Brown speaks of "systematic Romanization"; should we perhaps rather think of self-Romanization and see a spontaneous preference for the patterns of the ruling race? Under the empire there was prosperity, as we see from the magnificent establishment of a merchant and from the year-by-year filing of the record office as it is here reconstructed from remains, the analysis of which required great penetration. There is evidence of continued esteem for religious art types, notably Heracles and Aphrodite, and domestic piety is further indicated by a wall painting of one native deity and a bas-relief of another over the entries to stables. A bronze plaque, apparently from some kind of standard, is well analyzed by K. Lehmann-Hartleben. Feeling for the dead and a somewhat confused use of inherited phrases to express it are shown in the epitaph of the Roman tribune Julius Terentius, here edited anew by C. B. Welles.

Particular interest attaches to a series of records painted by one hand on the wall of a room of a late house, a room which had also a relief of Aphrodite. They are not scribbles, as H. Immerwahr observes in his admirable publication, but were set up with deliberate decorative intent. They record the comings and goings of entertainers and refer to their residence in what corresponded to the old theatrical lodgings. These entertainers have names, many of them Semitic (and on these we have H. Ingholt's comments), and epithets or nicknames. Many came from Zeugma; and Immerwahr makes some admirable inferences about them from a coin find. The result is a vivid chapter in the history of traveling entertainers as they flourished in antiquity and thereafter.

In conclusion, we have simply to express deep gratitude for the many revelations of painstaking scholarship contained in this monumental volume.

Harvard University

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THUCYDIDES. By *A. W. Gomme*, Lecturer in Greek and Greek History, University of Glasgow. Volume I, INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY ON BOOK I. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. xi, 480. \$6.00.)

THIS excellent study is the first volume of a projected three-volume commentary on Thucydides. As the title indicates, it is a "historical" commentary, designed to aid scholars wishing to trace the history of the Peloponnesian War; such matters as Thucydides' purposes in writing and his philosophy of history receive rather slight attention, and even the questions how and when he wrote his history are deferred to the third volume. The first eighty-seven pages are devoted to introductory matter, including a good account of the Greek art of war and discussions of our other sources for the history of the period; the remainder of the volume is a full commentary on Book I of the history. Countless major and minor questions are discussed, usually in the light of supplementary information gathered from other ancient historians, contemporary literary works, and inscriptions. Though Gomme by no means endows his author with infallibility, he usually defends his accuracy against modern critics. More than half the commentary is devoted to Thucydides' two excursions, the so-called *Archaeologia* and the *Pentecontaëtia*. In the former the historian briefly sketched Greek history from early times to the Persian wars in order to show that no earlier war had been so important or so worthy of study as the one he was going to write about. Gomme makes these few sentences the basis of long discussions of Minoan and Mycenaean civilization, Greek colonization, and kindred matters; such full discussions are scarcely justified in a commentary on Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War, yet they are not full enough to stand as independent studies. The commentary on the *Pentecontaëtia* (the sketch of the fifty years between 480 and 431) forms the heart of Gomme's book. It contains excellent studies of many problems center-

ing in this period, but in it the 16 pages of Thucydides' text receive 160 much larger pages of commentary. Thucydides tells us explicitly that he made this excursus to explain why Athens in 431 was feared and hated by the rest of Greece or, as it turns out, to show that Athens' unpopularity and the war were due primarily to her imperialism. Gomme gives a good commentary on the passages setting forth this view, and he is quite severe upon those critics who would make Thucydides an apologist of Athenian imperialism (p. 282). The commentator then fills many pages with materials for other aspects of Athenian history during these fifty years. He even declares (p. 148) that Thucydides deliberately began his narrative in 480 at the point where Herodotus had closed his story of Greek history. There can be little doubt that Thucydides had a high regard for Herodotus, though he occasionally corrected his predecessor; and there is little to be said in favor of the facile assumption, sometimes made, that he was aiming at Herodotus in his famous remark that he wrote *his* history, not as "a prize essay seeking the applause of the moment" but as "a possession forever." Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that Thucydides looked upon his history as a continuation of Herodotus. In view of Gomme's long demonstration (pp. 365-89) of the inadequacy of the *Pentecontaetia* as a general history of Athens or even of the Delian League—which Thucydides had no intention of writing—it is surprising to find him saying at the end of the volume (p. 465) that it is not necessary to discuss whether Thucydides' "view of the immediate and ultimate causes of the war is correct." It is to be hoped that the promised appendix to the third volume, which is to give Gomme's views on how the history was written, will contain a study of how Thucydides reached his opinions as to the causes of the war and an appraisal of them.

University of Illinois

J. W. SWAIN

RENAISSANCE LITERARY CRITICISM: A STUDY OF ITS SOCIAL CONTENT. By *Vernon Hall, jr.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. viii, 260. \$3.00.)

It is a pity that this book, so instructive, so well written, so observant, and so reasonable, should have adopted a wearisome plan. The book deals with the social content of the literary criticism of the Renaissance in Italy, France, and England, and treats the subject in each of these countries from six formal aspects. There are thus three chapters on the fight for the establishment of the vernacular in Italy, France, and England; likewise three chapters similarly distributed on each of the following subjects: "Theories of the Drama," "Theories of the Epic," "Scorn for the People," "Decorum and the Minor Genres," and the "Poet and His Purpose." It turns out that the fight for the establishment of English and French was much the same as that for the establishment of Italian, although of course there are interesting and significant differences in each case, not one of which, it may be said, the author fails to observe, record, and illustrate. Exactly the same situation exists

in each of the other five divisions. One cannot help a certain disappointment that the author has not brought these parallel features together, compared them, and subjected them to formal analysis.

It seems also unfortunate, again in the light of the excellence of the author's ability and of his workmanship, that the work, which is an interesting and important piece of exposition, should have been cast to such a degree in the form of an argument. The author announces and defends a thesis that no intelligent student of the Renaissance would ever seriously call in question. The thesis is that literary criticism in the Renaissance was aristocratic in social attitude and content. One does not see how it could possibly have been anything else, and of this fact the author, in his reasonableness, is most clearly aware. Criticism could not have been democratic (or individualistic) and free unless it had been modern, and modernity was a long way in the future. There are, to be sure, in England and other countries harbingers of a different kind of criticism, brief records of personal opinions and impressions of authors and works. Such are Cheke's comments on Latin writers recorded by Ascham in *The Scholemaster*, Sidney's outburst in praise of the ballad of "Chevy Chase," and various brief passages in Montaigne. But they are not part and parcel of the literary criticism of the age, which was, as the author clearly shows, channeled and circumscribed. Renaissance literary criticism was the protraction of Aristotle, Horace, Quintilian, and other ancient authors, and, as Mr. J. W. H. Atkins has shown, of medieval writers, school authorities, and rhetoricians. The neoclassical critical system worked out mainly in Italy was both restrictive and formalizing. Fortunately Elizabethan literature, particularly in lyric and drama, disregarded in part both classical and Italian teachings.

This criticism itself, it is rightly contended by Mr. Hall, was not only dominant as a system but was tied up closely both in theory and practice with the aristocracy and its beliefs and principles. It regarded, for example, the distinction between tragedy and comedy as social, and it set tragedy off with the epic as a form properly elevated in subject, language, and setting to kings and nobles. When the Renaissance critics favored the use of the vernacular instead of Latin, they said as a matter of course, and perhaps justifiably, that the native language adopted must be that of the better classes. Thus literary criticism did despise the vulgar herd and resented characteristically all attempts of the lower orders to intrude themselves into the domain of their betters. It also regarded decorum as consisting largely of the observance of things pertaining to social privilege. It regarded the typical poet as nobly born and one who had in his power the gift of fame. As to announced purpose, it was the teaching of morals through pleasure, and if, like the author, we take Spenser as representative, poets devoted themselves largely to the fashioning of a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline. Indeed, Renaissance critics were willing that poets should provide idle works to occupy the leisure of courtly persons.

These interesting and significant things do not need to be argued, for they are an obvious consequence of the monarchical governments and societies of the age, are legacies from ancient and medieval times, and are perfectly expressive of the current social thought of the Renaissance. There is no occasion for surprise or controversy.

What has been said may sound ungracious but it is not so intended. Modern students need to know the very things that are presented in this book, which is certainly learned, sagacious, and intelligent.

*University of North Carolina*

HARDIN CRAIG

## Modern European History

THE FALL OF THE OLD COLONIAL SYSTEM: A STUDY IN BRITISH FREE TRADE, 1770-1870. By *Robert Livingston Schuyler*, Gouverneur Morris Professor of History, Columbia University. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 344. \$3.00.)

THE original nucleus of this volume appeared in four articles on the commercial and military aspects of nineteenth century British imperialism and on the rise of anti-imperial sentiment, which were published in the *Political Science Quarterly* and the *American Historical Review* in the period 1917 to 1922. As Professor Schuyler says in his preface, these four essays have been "exhumed" and "reincarnated"; but he has modestly refrained from pointing out that their personalities have been very considerably changed in the process. They have been modified at certain points, and enlarged by the inclusion of a substantial amount of new matter; and, in addition, an introduction, on the origin and basic principles of the old colonial system, and two new chapters have been added. In its present completed form, the book thus presents a general survey of the slow retreat of the old mercantilism before the advance of the new conceptions associated with free trade.

It is true that certain evidences of the book's origins persist. Despite the fact that a large measure of continuity has been achieved, the organization of the volume retains something of the topical character which was involved in the original publication of separate articles. It may be that another student, tackling the problem afresh and as a whole, would have attempted to combine the various strands of his main theme in a more thorough integration. It may be that, in some such fashion, he could have conveyed a more complete and rounded picture of the various stages through which the second empire passed in the long process of its decline and fall. But, on the other hand, it is more than possible that he would have been driven back, by the sheer weight and intractability of the materials, into some such compromise between the chronological and topical methods as Professor Schuyler has himself adopted.

One other point, relating to the scope and organization of the book, deserves to be noticed. Professor Schuyler has been careful to indicate, in his preface, that he has intentionally limited his survey to colonial commerce and defense, and that no attempt has been made to discuss the administrative and constitutional aspects of the imperial system. These limitations, if such they can be called, are more formal than real. Even in the chapters on commerce and defense, as well as in the sections devoted to theories of empire, there is apparent throughout, and particularly at certain points, an awareness of political and constitutional problems, and an appreciation of their significance in a closely interrelated and interdependent whole. It is perhaps ungracious, therefore, even to think of asking more from a book which fulfills so admirably its expressed purpose. But though, as Professor Schuyler observes, the progressive enlargement of colonial self-government has already been the subject of an extensive literature, it has not often been studied in that wider context of imperial change of which he himself possesses so comprehensive an understanding. The grant of responsible government, and the achievement of colonial nationality (in Canadian confederation) can perhaps best be viewed, and appreciated, as positive parts of an extensive and interrelated process of imperial reorganization.

Within his own chosen and ample limits, Professor Schuyler has made a most important contribution. The virtues of his book are brevity, an admirable lucidity, and a generous and easy comprehensiveness. The tone throughout is judicious and urbane. It would be difficult, to take a few examples, to discover a clearer exposition of the commercial reforms introduced by Wallace, Robinson, and Huskisson, or a more succinct account of the evolution of the imperial defense system, or a more sober estimate of the part played by commercial regulation in the genesis of the American Revolution, than those which are included in this book. This reviewer can testify, at least in part, to the assistance which Professor Schuyler's original articles have provided for students of the old colonial system. It is to be expected that this new volume, which rounds out studies which have long called for completion, will have a more extended career of usefulness.

*University of Toronto*

D. G. CREIGHTON

MAN AND SOCIETY: THE SCOTTISH INQUIRY OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By *Gladys Bryson*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. ix, 287. \$3.00.)

THIS book is a contribution of a high order to historical sociology, both in its wide learning and sound scholarship, and also in the intelligence and insight which the author exhibits in interpreting the materials assembled. The volume is devoted to an exposition of the intellectual assumptions and social analysis displayed by the main writers of the so-called Scottish Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, chiefly, David Hume, Francis Hutcheson, Adam Smith, Thomas Reid, Adam Ferguson, Dugald Stewart, Lord Kames, and Lord Monboddo.



When we talk of an eighteenth century enlightenment, we usually have in mind the French Enlightenment, but the one in Scotland at the same time was in many ways quite as important as that created by the French rationalists. Surely, France produced no philosopher and psychologist at the time worthy to rank with Hume, or any economist at all equal to Adam Smith. Ferguson matched Montesquieu as a social philosopher and a historian of Rome. And the French philosophes did not equal the Scottish group in the number of their anticipations of the concepts and methods of the contemporary social sciences.

Dr. Bryson leads off with a substantial introduction in which she treats of the intellectual and cultural atmosphere of eighteenth century Scotland and the main assumptions, attitudes, and methods of these writers. She shows that they were not intellectually isolated but were in close touch with the thinking of the Continental writers of their age, especially those in France. They constituted a well-integrated group or school, the members of which exchanged ideas and passed them on from one generation to another. They were very influential in the later development of the social sciences—Hume in the growth of social psychology and sociology, Adam Smith in economics and sociology, Ferguson in historical sociology and social history, Lord Monboddo in anthropology, and all of them in suggesting at least a quasi-empirical approach to social ethics of a utilitarian cast.

Next, the author deals with Ferguson's system of moral philosophy, based on science, experience, and historical processes. Especially interesting is the chapter on "Man's Place in Nature," which stresses the naturalistic approach of these writers and their anticipation of many conceptions which have become popular since the days of Darwin. Lord Monboddo even suggested that man, in his earliest days, did not walk erect. The historical and sociological point of view dominated the attitude of the school relative to "Man's Past." Ferguson's *History of Civil Society* was probably the most important contribution to this field, but Hume's ideas were very sagacious and fruitful, his *Essays* being more important in this respect than his *History of England*. Hume definitely anticipated William Graham Sumner's doctrine of "folkways." And all of the writers partially forecast Stanley Hall's notion of recapitulation by holding that "the achievements of the human race could be charted in a unilinear development just as the life of an individual could be charted through the years of his life." They also believed in the natural and inevitable progress, not only of mankind as a whole but of each custom and institution.

Human nature, or the original nature of man, which was reconstructed on philosophical and psychological, rather than theological, grounds was the central feature in the thought of the whole school and the basis of all their social analysis. Their approach here was empirical; they believed that we can learn about human nature only by following scientific methods, and they held that it always behaves according to natural laws. In dealing with society, these writers distinguished between civil society, or the state, and society as a general concept and process. They contended that man is inherently social and maintained that society evolves

naturally out of this original sociability of the race. Hence, they opposed any such "artificial" hypothesis as the idea of the social contract, of which Hume was a leading assailant. They stressed the social division of labor, for which contribution Adam Smith is especially noted. In analyzing social institutions, they found institutions to be based on the nature of man and argued that they were to be judged by ethical standards, especially their contribution to the increase of human happiness. The school usually adopted the perspective of modern social science in their judgments, even though they were not always able to throw off all of the theological heritage in the traditional approach to the study of institutions.

In conclusion, Dr. Bryson shows that the Scottish school was both a dynamic influence and a restraint upon social thinking. They anticipated many modern concepts and methods in social science. But, also, their prestige was so great that their ideas still received all too great credence and respect in later days, when more reliable and scientific doctrines had appeared.

*Cooperstown, New York*

HARRY ELMER BARNES

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN: AN EXPOSITORY AND CRITICAL STUDY OF HIS MIND, THOUGHT, AND ART. By *Charles Frederick Harrold*.

(New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1945. Pp. xv, 472. \$3.50.)

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. By *John Moody*. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1945. Pp. ix, 353. \$3.75.)

THESE two interpretations of Newman, which mark the centenary of his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1845, differ greatly from each other in outlook, scope, and merit. Mr. Harrold is an Episcopalian, Mr. Moody a Roman Catholic convert. Mr. Harrold offers a series of essays on different aspects of Newman, while Mr. Moody has written a short biography. Mr. Moody, to pass critical judgment on him first, adds little to our knowledge or understanding of Newman. His account is pleasant, but conventional and lacking in depth. Despite his wide reading, he has not quite the scholarly expertness and the historical background necessary for this very difficult subject, and on the deeper issues of Newman's career he is not wholly adequate.

Newman, with his complex and paradoxical nature and his amazing intellectual gifts, remains one of the most interesting figures of the nineteenth century. He presents a subtle problem to the historian, and can be understood only in a broad intellectual and historical frame of reference. He is still a center of controversy, although new issues have partly replaced the old ones. In the nineteenth century Protestants abused him for apostasy; agnostics accused him of stupidity or cowardice because he found his solution to life in revealed religion; theologians were not invariably respectful to his views on doctrinal development. If these battles still go on, they no longer hold the center of the stage. Today it seems more enlightening to ask, not, Can we accept Newman's conclusions verbatim?

but rather, What role did he play in history? What significance has his career in relation to larger developments, the reaction against liberalism and individualism, against materialism? In these difficult speculations Mr. Harrold supplies discriminating guidance. He recalls that the liberalism Newman attacked was not political liberalism in the usual sense, and also that Newman was very much of an individualist in some ways, notably in his ideas on education. As for Newman's anti-materialism, it is tempting to say that in his religious arguments he anticipated symbolically and subjectively the spiritual difficulties and struggles of the present age. But we dare not push this too far. Newman meant his remarks on dogma plainly and literally. As Mr. Harrold rightly says, he was as far from any kind of subjective immanentism as he was (despite superficial resemblances) from the Catholic modernism of Loisy and Houtin which was condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. Unfortunately lack of space prevents a detailed examination of Mr. Harrold's views. In general he shows maturity and breadth, grasps both the technical problems and the wider issues, and sheds a steady light on many different aspects of Newman's work. I found him least complete on Newman's political ideas; there are some interesting implications here he does not cover. On theological questions Mr. Harrold claims to be just an amateur, but actually in this field as in others he proceeds with accuracy, ease, and sureness. His book is thoughtful and solid, a valuable contribution.

Princeton University

WILLIAM O. AYDELOTTE

THE LETTERS AND PRIVATE PAPERS OF WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. Collected and edited by *Gordon N. Ray*. In four volumes. Volume I, 1817-1840. Volume II, 1841-1851. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. clxxiii, 522; viii, 833. Vols. I and II, \$12.50.)

THE student of British history in the nineteenth century who reads *Vanity Fair* must wonder over the sureness of touch which makes that novel a penetrating portrayal of the rise to power of a new group of Mammon-worshippers. Now, thanks largely to the constant piety of Lady Ritchie, Thackeray's daughter, and of her daughter, Mrs. Richard Fuller, in collecting and preserving letters and diaries, it has proved possible for an indefatigable American scholar to surmount Thackeray's injunction against a biography and to demonstrate that the novelist himself was an active participant in every show and side show of "Vanity Fair." His family was Anglo-Indian; he and they were variously involved in the genteel but ignoble transition of patronage from the aristocracy to the upper middle class; they lost their money in Indian bank failures and English railway speculations; and they sought refuge from creditors and from what was expected of persons in their station by living in Paris or elsewhere on the Continent. Thackeray paid dearly to learn that he could not afford gambling. He almost died during a cholera epidemic. By prodigious expenditure of his gifts after his tragic marriage in 1836

(*actat.* 25), he made himself financially secure by the time *Vanity Fair* was finished in 1848.

When that revolutionary year passed without a British revolution, and the Victorian boom began, the new middle class had at last arrived, as witness the Great Exhibition of 1851. Although these two volumes end with that year, Thackeray's first forty years reveal the price that was being paid. The anti-romanticist became romantic. The antisentimentalist almost gloried in sentimentality. The castigator of snobs (in the general sense as well as in the special sense of "townee") emerged as the successful London social climber who dearly loved a lord. Like the middle class, he somewhat redeemed himself by his generosity to the less fortunate and by his decency. In defending *Vanity Fair*, he protested to a newspaper editor, "The only moral that I, as a writer, wished to hint in the descriptions against which you protest, was, that it was the duty of a literary man, as well as any other, to practise regularity and sobriety, to love his family and to pay his tradesmen" (II, 633-34).

It seems almost needless to say that these volumes are a treasure house for the social historian as well as a delight to the student of letters and to those who will savor Thackeray's skill in rapid sketching. Few except the proletarian aspects of western Europe during the second quarter of the nineteenth century escape reflection (*e.g.*, the role of the iron bed in combatting the ubiquitous bedbug), but many important images are faint. Schiller receives attention, but Goethe does not. Although Thackeray was one of three Cambridge students who wrestled with Malthus and Mill in 1829, although he could not help being aware of English and Continental revolutionary movements from Catholic Emancipation to the diffusion of Chartism, and although he electioneered in the West Country for Buller in 1832, his political and economic perceptions were usually casual and flippant. Like so many nabobs, smarting under Tory and Whig contempt, he at first thought that he was a Philosophical Radical, but only until the middle class and he came swiftly into their own after 1846. Probably the richest historical ore to be worked in these volumes is the material on the profession of letters, for Thackeray, his friends, and acquaintances ranged from hacks to best sellers and Thackeray himself, like the middle class, had scruples about bookkeeping and set down his takings as well as his expenses, gambling losses, and adventures in bill discounting. On the purely personal side, Thackeray was subjected to such tensions by his wild oats before marriage and by his relations with an insatiable mother, a self-righteous sister, a wife who became insane, a vulgar mother-in-law, and a friend's wife who reciprocated his love, that the reader of these intimate records shares the writhings of a mid-nineteenth century conscience.

All in all, Dr. Ray has given us the personification of the Victorian Compromise. He and the long list of individuals and institutions (not least the Harvard University Press), whose co-operation provided these handsome volumes and the two to come, have put the world of scholarship deeply in their debt. The

editorial apparatus is ingenious, meticulous, and opulent even to some redundant footnotes of attribution. In publishing well over 800 items from a collection of 1,600 Thackeray letters, 100 related letters, and 19 diaries and account books, editorial and typographical slips are practically nonexistent. With some English sources still to be traced, an edition of newly attributed articles to be published, and a biography of Thackeray to be written, Dr. Ray has a career stretching out before him. It is to be hoped that he will escape both obsession and satiety with an ambivalent, often disappointing, yet lively and entertaining personality.

Columbia University

J. B. BREBNER

BISMARCK: LEBEN UND WERK. Bände II, III. By *Erich Eyck*. (Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag. 1943, 1944. Pp. 630, 687.)

THE author's original plan to complete this biography of Bismarck in only two volumes was wisely modified. The first volume (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLIX [July, 1944], 713) which surveyed the early life and the first two years of the ministry, ending with the peace with Denmark and the fall of Rechberg in the autumn of 1864, has been followed by the second, covering the seven years during which the German Empire was made, and by a third, only a few pages longer, on the rest of Bismarck's life, nineteen years as imperial chancellor, eight as the embittered "hermit of the Sachsenwald." The chronological division is very uneven but it may be justified on the ground that the seven years described in Volume II are those of Bismarck's most important and creative achievement.

As was pointed out in the review of Volume I, Eyck has set himself the task of presenting the figure and the history of the great German statesman in such a way that it will be vivid not only for the specialist but also for the historically or politically interested layman. That task has been completed with success. The specialist may deplore the lack of systematic bibliography and footnotes (the references are to the pages of the text and are relegated to the end of each volume) but he will agree with the layman in appreciating the skillful organization of the complex material, the easy style, and the sensible and sometimes penetrating comment.

Three volumes with a total of about 1,900 pages may not seem too much for a statesman of Bismarck's importance and length of service. Yet, since his death in 1898, only one biography, and that by a Frenchman, has been published on this scale. P. Matter's *Bismarck et son temps* (3 vols., Paris, 1905-1908) is of course long out of date. Of the important German biographies, that by Max Lenz has very little on the period of the empire; that by Dietrich Schäfer is a nationalistic panegyric; and those by Erich Marcks are a fragment (two volumes to 1850) of what was expected to be the standard, and a brilliant but brief "Lebensbild," summarized for the centenary celebration of the hero's birth.

One reason, no doubt, why no other large-scale German work was attempted,

was the tacit assumption that Marcks had priority rights. Another, of course, was the fact that until the archives were opened after 1918, relatively few of the essential sources for Bismarck's career after 1858 were accessible. Since 1918, the mass of published records has been overwhelming and the huge collections of documents have been supplemented by additional memoirs and biographies of Bismarck's contemporaries and by scores of monographs and articles based on the sources in public and private archives. Of special significance has been the increase in the number of studies of domestic policies. There are probably few aspects of Bismarck's career on which important sources have been withheld. It was time that this material be synthesized and, an exile in Switzerland where books could freely enter, Eyck could write without fear or favor.

The point of view from which these volumes are written is that of a German liberal, an admirer of Bismarck's courage and skill, and of the *kleindeutsch* solution of the problem of German unity. Eyck is not, however, an idolator. He brings out Bismarck's sensitiveness to opposition, his tendency to see in it motives of person rather than of principle, and exposes with ample evidence, the chancellor's efforts to put the blame for his mistakes on others and to create a Bismarck legend.

In concluding my review of Eyck's first volume, I expressed the opinion that the way in which he dealt with the problems of the period after 1864 would be the real test of his competence. He has not solved them all. Bismarck's fertility in expedients, his versatility in tactics, his dazzling skill in blending falsehood and truth, and his convincing papers and speeches are often as baffling to historians as they were to his diplomatic and parliamentary opponents and to his king. On nearly every controversial point, where a choice of interpretations is possible, I find myself in substantial agreement with Eyck.

Bismarck's Reich is in ruins for the second time in a generation. Some of the responsibility for the failures of Bismarck's successors must, as Eyck points out, be shared by the iron chancellor himself. He talked of teaching Germany to ride but he never put her in the saddle. In the 1870's, when there were still many men of high ability in the *Reichstag*, he kept them from sharing responsibility. Most striking of all, he trained no qualified diplomats to take his place when his inevitable end should come. His amorality in politics by its very success poisoned the mind and spirit of his country and set the precedents for his less skillful imitators. In Eyck's concluding words:

Niemand kann sich der faszinierenden Anziehungskraft dieses Menschen entziehen, der im guten wie im bösen immer eigenartig und immer bedeutend ist. Er konnte geschmeidig sein wie ein Höffing, fein und geistreich wie ein Marquis der alten Schule, spöttisch und satirisch wie Heinrich Heine, zartfühlend und weich wie ein Poet—aber auch hart und brutal wie ein Despot der Renaissance, verschlagen wie ein Fuchs, und mutig wie ein Löwe. Grösseren Reichtum hat die Natur nur selten in einer Person vereinigt. Aber den Sinn für Recht und Gerechtigkeit hat sie ihm versagt.

University of Minnesota

LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL



BUILDING LENIN'S RUSSIA. By *Simon Liberman*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. v, 229. \$3.00.)

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL works by leading participants in the Russian Revolution are few, what with the purges and the relative anonymity demanded by Communist party discipline. Consequently this book is welcome as an addition in this field.

The late Simon Liberman was a Menshevik, as well as a successful timber specialist, who served at the head of the timber industry of Soviet Russia from 1918 to 1926. He was moved to co-operation with the Bolsheviks by a love for his native Russia and the desire to see the proletarian society realized. This book deals largely with his experiences and the men he encountered during those years. It appeared originally in Russian as *Dela i Liudi: na Sovetskoi Stroike* (New York, 1944). With the aid of Dr. Albert Parry this English version, employing an easy English style, has been prepared. It differs from the Russian original in some details of organization and content, and its epilogue has been considerably expanded.

Liberman treats principally two topics: the Bolshevik leaders with whom he came in contact and his activities at the head of the timber industry. He presents discerning sketches of Lenin, gentle in preliminaries and firm in final action, concrete and practical as well as theoretical and dogmatic; Michael Larin, brilliant visionary deviser of unrealistic economic schemes; Leonid Krassin, active Bolshevik and successful businessman who organized Soviet foreign trade; Alexis Ryckov, chairman of the Supreme Economic Council, no political figure but able and loyal; Stalin grasping the instruments of power; Trotsky as war lord, aloof, snobbish, and conscious of his historical importance. The timber industry was of critical importance during the early years of Bolshevik rule, since it afforded the most available and abundant export and the readiest source of fuel. Liberman organized the North Timber Trust, which became the model for the formation of other government trusts. He also was the Soviet regime's chief timber salesman abroad. But he became suspect by the Cheka because of his Menshevik antecedents and employment of non-Bolshevik specialists. His increasing difficulties with the Cheka after the death of Lenin, his strongest supporter, led him finally to break with the Soviet regime. The epilogue of the book explains the great wartime achievement of the Soviet people as the outgrowth of a special kind of dictatorship which has released the energies and creativeness of its peoples and which, though not in accord with the Western concept of democracy, will eventually evolve along more democratic lines. It is a judicious appraisal, although one need not agree with all details of the interpretation.

While the research scholar will probably not find much of direct use to him, outside of the discussion of the timber industry, this book has much of human interest. From it the reader gains something of the spirit and feeling of the times—

an impression that the Revolution was something more than inhuman forces and events, that individuals were struggling to build a new society. Yet written two decades or more after the events and in considerable detachment, this account reveals a calm and moderation that must belie the passion and struggle of those early years.

Washington, D. C.

RAYMOND H. FISHER

## Far Eastern History

ASIA FOR THE ASIATICS? THE TECHNIQUES OF JAPANESE OCCUPATION. By *Robert S. Ward*. Introduction by Laurence Salisbury. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 205. \$3.00.)

UNTIL a very few months ago most Americans basked in the belief that millions of Indo-Chinese and Indonesians were indifferent concerning their political and economic future or were reconciled to a return of the altered façades of European empires. Suddenly the illusion vanished. The defeated Japanese allowed themselves to be disarmed by popular resistance forces in various parts of "Greater East Asia," thus giving power and articulation to oppressed nationalists.

This review is being written on Christmas Day, 1945. Exactly four years ago Robert Ward watched the surrender of Hongkong after eighteen days of outclassed resistance. As an American consul he was interned for six months on the island and later was repatriated on the *Gripsholm*. Personal observation, interviews with eyewitnesses, and newspaper articles (particularly the Japanese-controlled *Hong Kong News*) enabled Mr. Ward to analyze in detail the methods of control enforced by the Japanese in the "Conquered Territory." Systematically he describes the effective Nipponese control established over Hongkong's police, food and raw materials, movements of population, public services, transportation, industry, finance, business and workers' associations, and all cultural institutions. Especially significant were the devices by which Chinese leaders and groups were won or compelled into the service of their new masters.

But the samurai sword, which, on the book's jacket, is shown whistling down on eastern Asia, should have been double-edged. *Asia for the Asiatics?* is as moot now as when "Greater East Asia" was being constructed. The Japanese made full and telling use of British (and other Occidental) injustice, racial discrimination, and rapid collapse. Furthermore,

The situation in Hong Kong is . . . different from that in Europe. In the Crown Colony under British rule the Chinese had only "colonial" status; they had been submerged by the white man and are now being "rescued" by the Japanese. These informants agree that the Chinese in Hong Kong may hate the Japanese military but that they tend to regard the Japanese civilian as being, after all, of the same race as themselves, an attitude which makes for an easier camaraderie between them [*sic*]. The Chinese in Hong Kong after the Japanese came could also talk

quite freely among themselves and were not ordinarily overborne by any feeling of very strict supervision; they suffered more from the confusion of the government than from its harshness. There are thus no deep loyalties, no sound historic or political basis, from which the desperate underground activities which have characterized Yugoslav or Greek resistance could spring in Hong Kong [pp. 77-78].

When the tide of war turned against the "Co-Prosperity Sphere," its sponsors ostentatiously granted "independence" to captured colonies. Moreover, they astutely laid a trap into which the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and France are still walking with their eyes wide open in an attempt to reconvert southeastern Asia to a now impossible *status quo ante*. Probably Mr. Ward would agree that there is little danger of a voluntary unification of Oriental peoples against exploitation by white empires; Asia is torn by at least as many schisms as the West. But the author points out how a return in substance to prewar conditions in colonial areas evacuated by Japan will be to re-erect houses of cards which only await another Oriental offensive to collapse.

*Oberlin College*

ALLAN B. COLE

## American History

A NATION OF NATIONS. By *Louis Adamic*. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1945. Pp. 399. \$3.50.)

Mr. Adamic writes with a chip on his shoulder which may as well be knocked off at the outset. He charges American historians with having ignored the part played in American life by non-British national stocks. On the contrary, they have contributed much toward a fair evaluation of the subject. He himself states that "the material on many of the groups is enormous," and the works of Blegen, Hansen, Stephenson, Wittke, and many others cited in his bibliography afford the best refutation of the charge.

Mr. Adamic wants "a re-evaluation in the facts of the American Story so that Immigration might cease to be a footnote on page 317 and become a main subject in the text." Immigration *is* a main subject in every text the reviewer has ever used either as student or teacher, nor can an index entry under "Anglo-Saxon," Mr. Adamic's pet bogey, be found in any of them. Historians such as Wilson, Fiske, Lodge, and Hart, whom he singles out for especial criticism, did not ignore the subject as completely as he imagines, and furthermore their works have been largely replaced by the authors mentioned above. He is a Don Quixote tilting at the windmills of fifty years ago.

There is a wealth of good human interest material in the book. The author is to be commended also for speaking out against intolerance of the various groups for one another. But the reader will be irritated by a number of rather incon-

sequential but elementary errors, e.g. that John and Sebastian Cabot were brothers, that the Arabs are a Negro tribe, that at Bunker Hill was fired the shot heard round the world, that Daniel Boone (with the aid of two Poles) founded Harrodsburg. The author solves the Croatoan problem (Raleigh's lost colony) by means of some mythical *Croatian* sailors; but he dismisses the historical fact of the Scotch-Irish by declaring them to be a myth. In this connection, he does not seem to be aware of the "Report of the Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks in the Population of the United States" (American Historical Association, *Annual Report for 1931*, I, 103-441).

It is unfortunate that a publicist of Mr. Adamic's undoubted courage, honesty, and ability should lend his talents to popularizing an untenable position in regard to the writing and teaching of American history. The real enemy he means to combat is prejudice and in that struggle the historical profession will be glad to have him join.

Colorado College

HARVEY L. CARTER

CONRAD WEISER, 1696-1760: FRIEND OF COLONIST AND MOHAWK.

By Paul A. W. Wallace. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1945. Pp. xiv, 648. \$5.00.)

Mr. Wallace's *Conrad Weiser* is one of the most important treatises on Indian affairs ever written, and as such it should be judged. It is disappointing as a biography. Farmer, Indian agent, quondam monk, begetter of numerous progeny, missionary, judge, colonel of militia—Conrad Weiser must have been a colorful figure but he never quite comes to life in this massive study. He does, however, emerge as indubitably the greatest interpreter and Indian ambassador of the eighteenth century.

Weiser's success stemmed from the significant fact that he was as much a friend of the red man as of the white; his was a double loyalty. Both sides knew him to be fair. The Iroquois held him in such veneration that from 1742 to 1758, when jealous Sir William Johnson forbade them to use so exalted a title, they called him Tarachiwagon: "Father of the Peoples." Likewise, the proprietors, James Logan, and Thomas Lee ("a high Man in his own Country"), sought his advice, levied on his unrivaled knowledge of "forest statecraft and swamp diplomacy," and deferred to his judgment. Between 1731 and 1736, through the good offices of Shickellamy, Conrad Weiser successfully implemented James Logan's "new Indian policy" which aimed at strengthening the hands of the Six Nations to enable them the better to answer for the actions of tributary tribes like the Delaware. By 1743 Weiser had really assumed charge of the Indian affairs of Pennsylvania and for some time with great skill succeeded in steering his brothers of the Six Nations on their tortuous course between the intrigues of the French and the reprehensible politics of the colony of New York. But, as Mr. Wallace

vividly shows, "by 1754 Pennsylvania's Indian relations were all in confusion. The clear pattern that James Logan, Shickellamy, and Conrad Weiser had traced and that Thomas Lee had approved, was now all splotched with blood and bile; the death of Logan, Shickellamy, and Lee, the jealousy of New York, the break-up of the Six Nations politically and morally, war, intrigue, rum, French missionaries, Clinton, Johnson, Lydius, Croghan, Montour, settlers on the Juniata, boundary disputes with Maryland and Virginia . . . Connecticut's grab at the Wyoming Valley. Everything was criss-cross and Weiser frankly at a loss. 'I am perplexed with Indian affairs,' he wrote, 'and Can not say such or such is best.'"

The broad outlines of this story have long been known, but the subtleties have never before been so clearly revealed nor so amply buttressed by research. Mr. Wallace has no hesitancy in criticizing policies or in naming names. Richard Peters was a self-seeking double-dealer, Croghan a drunken Indian trader unfitted for the important job he came to hold, Sir William Johnson "a politician who worked best in the half light." That they opposed Weiser when his superior knowledge and judgment pointed to a better and fairer course was no doubt true, but viewed from the vantage point of their own responsibilities and needs they might deserve another kind of reading. Never before has the case for proprietorial Indian policy been so ably argued, and it must be admitted that in the efforts of Quakers at the time, and of their historians since, to obscure the colony's policy, special pleading has attained the dignity of a fine art. Mr. Wallace's brute facts are hard to answer. After Braddock's defeat, on which there are some incisive comments, the Quakers as much as any other group must bear the responsibility for the policy that "kicked away" the Indian allies of Pennsylvania. Pontiac's conspiracy was born of the failure of Indian policy after 1754.

The inclusion of so many documents in full makes this study virtually a source book; a third of it is quoted material consisting of diaries, journals, Indian treaties, reports, and letters, many of which have never before been printed. One regrets, since Mr. Wallace writes so gracefully, that he did not digest and interpret the bulk of these documents for us. We might have glimpsed a little more of Weiser the person, since as the foremost German of the colonial period he was indeed worthy of study on his own account.

*Institute of Early American History and Culture*

CARL BRIDENBAUGH

PREACHING IN THE FIRST HALF CENTURY OF NEW ENGLAND HISTORY. By *Babette May Levy*. [Studies in Church History, Volume VI.] (Hartford: American Society of Church History. 1945. Pp. vii, 215. \$3.00.)

In this almost entirely factual report Miss Levy has gleaned from the sermons of Massachusetts, Plymouth, and Connecticut printed before 1684 the story of how the preachers tried and failed to build their City of God. The chapter, "Sermonic Similitudes: A Sidelight upon the Puritan Mind," breaks fresh and fertile ground.

The preachers "found their most apt illustrations in everyday life and existence" (p. 107). These sermons show how preachers and congregations apparently thought about husbands and wives, parents and children, the sun and the sea and the seasons, physiology of both men and plants, and a host of other revealing common-places. The author has cleared a new field in the wilderness of New England's intellectual history.

The least rewarding chapter, "Practical Teaching: Politics and War," tells very little about either politics or war. The author seems unaware that the "election sermon" was not supposed to be a guide to politics but only another earnest exhortation to the electors to behave themselves and support the church. "The artillery sermon" before the annual parade of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston was even lower. "The Artillery," which never had a piece of artillery, was an English drinking club whose chief interests, besides drink, were gaudy uniforms and parades. Like every other gathering, sober or drunk, in order to keep respectable, "the Artillery" had to have a sermon. This chapter would have been greatly strengthened by the inclusion of Increase Mather's "An Earnest Exhortation" of 1676, which reveals more concerning the politics, especially of land distribution, and the war policies of the Bay Colony than all the sermons quoted by Miss Levy. This sermon is found in T. J. Holmes's definitive two-volume study of Mather, which is also overlooked.

"Democracy" in early Connecticut as expounded by Hooker and his followers is somewhat uncritically admired. Miss Levy apparently fails to realize that Hooker's concept of "the people" was not much broader than that held in the more conservative Bay Colony. Hooker's contribution to the development of popular government seems to have been limited to a lessening of the emphasis upon church membership as a *sine qua non* for voting in civil affairs. Connecticut's "democracy" in the seventeenth century excluded women, Catholics, servants, Indians, and those who owned no property.

In spite of these minor criticisms Miss Levy gives a competent account of her subject. However, the reader will not find in these pages a penetrating analysis of the contradictions in the tortured lives of the early New England preachers, or a significant inclusion of the social, economic, and political realities with which they had to deal.

The book includes an excellently arranged bibliography and an index.

Northland College

MORRISON SHARP

THE LAST OF THE COCKED HATS: JAMES MONROE AND THE VIRGINIA DYNASTY. By *Arthur Styron*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1945. Pp. xiii, 480. \$3.50.)

It was Mr. Styron's design in this volume to offer not only an account of the life and times of James Monroe but also to present "the fullness of time . . . which



produced his character, and influenced his behavior." This method, he writes, assumes that it is the function of biography to "reintegrate" all the forces and factors—history, language, literature, philosophy, sociology, religion—which compose human life. Mr. Styron admits that Monroe was a "man whose life ranked in the common model," who was "neither conspicuously brilliant nor highly talented"; but he believes him to be a happy choice of subject for a biography which will throw light on the nature of democracy.

In attempting to analyze all the historical forces which influenced Monroe, Mr. Styron traces the course of Western civilization from the fall of Constantinople to the first rumbles of the American Civil War. In a style suave and frequently epigrammatic, he has dallied speculatively over certain phases: the rivalries of the European nations for colonies in the New World; the causes of the American Revolution; "the atavistic instinct of authoritarianism" in government from the Babylonians to the Nazis; the moral and sociological aspects of Negro slavery in the South and white labor in northern factories; New England transcendentalism; and many others.

On virtually every question he discusses Mr. Styron has a decided opinion; intellectually, he is a southerner whose democracy is derived from Thomas Jefferson, John Randolph, and John C. Calhoun. He crowds his pages with dogmatic generalization. The French and the Jeffersonians, of whom he approves, were all "realistic" and "logical-minded." Randolph was "the Southern Radical Aristocrat" who recognized that there is good and evil in all men and knew how they should be harmonized. Calhoun perceived that the real impulse of the antislavery movement was not humanitarian reform "since the industrialists meant to shatter the Union to bits and remold it in a uniform nation." Mr. Styron dislikes the English people and the Federalist party; according to him, they both had an affinity to Puritanism, of which he does not approve either. The English mind "wavers and fumbles at any sort of logical thinking." "In politics," he writes, George Washington "was a plain stuffed shirt." Alexander Hamilton "made no important contribution to state papers, and his financial accomplishments were those of which any good bank clerk would have been capable."

It is sometimes a little hard to find Mr. Styron's hero. Of his first one hundred pages, covering the period up to Monroe's election to the Virginia assembly, about eight deal directly with the subject of the biography. Although Monroe looms larger from then on, he is always subordinated to discussion of the forces which influenced him. Sketchily treated are such topics as Monroe the practical politician who was elected governor of Virginia four times, Monroe the leader of the Senate opposition to the Washington administration, Monroe as President Madison's somewhat ineffectual Secretary of State and of War. The section on the domestic problems of Monroe's own two terms in the presidency is cursory, which is especially to be regretted since it is a subject which has never been adequately investigated. Nor does Mr. Styron attempt to analyze the transformation of Monroe

the crusading young anti-Federalist into the amiable conservative of the Era of Good Feeling. He does somewhat better with his passages on foreign problems. His account of the Monroe mission to France during the Adams administration is lively and fairly complete. Monroe's part in bringing about the Louisiana Purchase and his service as minister to Great Britain and Spain are described in vague fashion. Some of Mr. Styron's recital of the steps taken to create the Monroe Doctrine is illuminating; most of it is devoted to sonorous generalities about "hemispheric unity."

The wealth of historical allusion, the dubious interpretation, the meagerness of biographical narrative which characterize the volume make it obvious that Mr. Styron has read widely but indiscriminately. This conclusion is corroborated by his extensive, atrociously edited bibliography. Mr. Styron lists one of the two major collections of Monroe manuscripts, as well as twelve minor collections of the period; but there is little evidence of their use in his pages. He cites as authorities such marginal writers in the historical field as Walter Lippmann, Paul Winkler, Sumner Welles, and Porter Sargent; he appears oblivious to the information bearing directly on Monroe's career which he might have gleaned from the monographs of Dexter Perkins, Beverly W. Bond, jr., E. Wilson Lyon, and E. H. Tatum, jr.—to mention only examples from the field of foreign relations.

The University of Oklahoma Press has made Mr. Styron's always stimulating and frequently provoking book into a compact and attractive volume, with a format charmingly redolent of the age of Monroe.

*Washington, D. C.*

RAYMOND WALTERS, JR.

THE AGE OF JACKSON. By *Arthur M. Schlesinger, jr.* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1945. Pp. xiv, 577. \$5.00.)

Mr. Schlesinger's book is a reinterpretation and revaluation of the Jacksonian tradition, and as such, in view of the almost constant and widely divergent interests of historians in the Jacksonian period, will excite both dissidence and praise for its extremely careful and often brilliant analysis of the era it undertakes to interpret. The thesis upon which it is admittedly built can be simply stated: that the tradition of Jacksonian democracy was primarily a reform tradition, dedicated to a struggle against the entrenched business interests of the national community. In this contest—and this is Mr. Schlesinger's most unusual contribution to the historical literature of the period—the political strength of the eastern workingman, and not the intermittent radicalism of the West and South, formed the backbone and sinews of Jacksonian power; by reason of this support, Jackson added economic freedom to the political freedom that Jeffersonianism had already established as a demand. The West, Mr. Schlesinger points out, furnished ideas and leaders—Benton, Polk, and Tappan, among others, and of course Jackson himself—but the real driving force in the practical application of Jacksonian

reform principles came from the workingmen of the seaboard and their political leaders, from the areas where corporate interests were most powerful and arrogant, and where the substratum of revolt against wealth was strong enough and consistent enough to maintain a program, execute it, and make Jacksonism a vital factor in politics and political theory. On the verge of codification and unification, at the moment of its emergence as a full-fledged political philosophy, however, the Jacksonian tradition split on the rock of slavery, its pressing economic issues submerged in moral arguments and its force lost in the wave of interest aroused by the new controversy.

It is clear from the author's statement of his thesis that he considers the impetus of Jacksonian principles as chiefly stemming from economics, as the awakening of the have-nots in the period 1830 to 1860 to the encroachments of the haves upon American political and economic life, and that he believes the history of the era to be read in terms not of party battles but of economic and social cleavages. The fact that the West wanted some things, and the East others, and that the Jacksonian program was able to satisfy and retain the support of both, provides for the book one of its most provocative sections and one of its keenest analyses of political motivations. With the ascent to power of Jackson, Mr. Schlesinger agrees, his program alienated some of its original western sources of support. His opposition to federal subsidization of internal improvements, for example, while unsatisfactory to the West, was balanced by his fiscal policy, equally unsatisfactory to the eastern workingman. The antistatism of the old Jeffersonian tradition, from which Jackson inherited much of his southern support, fitted ill with the strong-government predilections of Old Hickory and with the demands of the East for a national ally against banking and industry. So too did Jacksonism make strange bedfellows—Calhoun and Van Buren, Taney and Benton—and align for the moment, until the slavery issue divorced them, the defensive and the aggressive wings of democracy, the conservative and the radical. Yet, as Mr. Schlesinger points out, the trend of Jackson's administration, its spirit, its emphasis on the rights of the masses and the workers, and its advocacy of general reform, seemed all things to all who supported it. Because it embraced within it the essential doctrines of one great stream of the American political tradition, it succeeded in consolidating divergent forces and personalities. It gave expression to what Mr. Schlesinger calls the "basic meaning" of American liberalism, that is, the eternal struggle of the many for political and economic freedom from the power of the entrenched conservatism of the economically dominant few.

Inescapable in any treatment of a period, of course, is some repetition of fact and interpretations already familiar, but there is surprisingly little of this in Mr. Schlesinger's work, which is for the most part fresh and apparently newly mined, if one may judge from his sources. Possibly the most valuable contributions to the literature of Jacksonism, in addition to his central thesis, are the author's six chapters dealing with the new democratic spirit as it manifested itself in intel-

lectual movements, in its relations to legal, literary, economic, religious, and utopian thought. That the Jacksonian philosophy, if it may so be called, was something much more comprehensive than a political platform and something which, for forty years and more, exerted significant pressure upon American thought in related areas of intellectual endeavor is clear to those who see history as something more than political conflict. Lawyers Taney and Field, Kneeland, Brownson and the early transcendentalists, Brisbane and the Fourierites, Whitman, Bryant, Hawthorne, and Cooper in literature—in most fields of thought and creative effort the Jacksonian idea took root, and the affirmation of the rights of the common individual as against the privileges of interest colored the nation's thinking by reason of a "desertion of the intellectuals" from the defense of the conservative status quo. Though Mr. Schlesinger is somewhat hard on the tender-minded who preferred to remain above the practicalities of life rather than shout with the crowd, and though he recognizes but imperfectly that Emerson in his own fashion was perhaps making vital contributions to the philosophy of liberation, his survey of the infiltration of the Jacksonian spirit into the interconnected channels of American thought is rich in insight and extremely penetrating.

"American history," remarks the author, "has been marked by recurrent swings of conservatism and liberalism." Mr. Schlesinger is clearly on the side of liberalism, which he defines as "the movement on the part of other sections of society to restrain the power of the business community." Possibly the most provocative section of his book is the last, "Traditions of Democracy," in which he surveys the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian traditions, in all their mutations, to their present-day emergence in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. To call the book, as did one reviewer for a national magazine, an attempt to supply a missing link between Jefferson and the New Deal is manifestly too broad a statement for justice. It is, as its final summing up indicates, rather an attempt to trace, from Jefferson through Jackson, the liberal tradition as defined in Mr. Schlesinger's terms, which seem to this reviewer to be essentially the correct ones. The history of the Jacksonian era, he feels, illustrates a theory of social tension which lies at the basis of American history and which is operative today—a constant struggle between the extremes of socialism and conservatism, resulting in an equilibrium which we may call democracy.

Mr. Schlesinger's style is lively and pungent, written with an attention to epigrammatic conciseness that lends itself to readability, though it is occasionally overstretched in the creation of a flashing phrase. For such a panoramic survey of a complex period, the book is exceptionally clear and capably organized. Worth mentioning is the author's habit of briefly summarizing each chapter by a paragraph of introduction, outlining its intent and scope, and his expert sketches of minor figures, such as Mike Walsh, C. C. Cambreleng, and Orestes Brownson. Portions of the book, especially its analyses of western liberalism, its treatment of Whig politics, and of personalities such as Greeley and Thoreau, will provoke

some disagreement, but in general, Mr. Schlesinger's central thesis and his interpretations by it of the age of Jackson cannot be casually dismissed. His book is a valuable piece of work and, in this reviewer's estimation, is the most stimulating historical writing of the past decade.

Michigan State College

RUSSEL B. NYE

THE LETTERS OF JOHN McLOUGHLIN FROM FORT VANCOUVER TO THE GOVERNOR AND COMMITTEE: THIRD SERIES, 1844-46. Edited by E. E. Rich, Fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. With an Introduction by W. Kaye Lamb, Librarian of the University of British Columbia. [The Publications of the Champlain Society, Hudson's Bay Company Series, VII.] (Toronto: Champlain Society. 1944. Pp. lxii, 341.)

THIS third and concluding volume brings to a close Dr. John McLoughlin's correspondence with the company he had served for twenty-five years. (For reviews of the previous volumes see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVIII [July, 1943], 839; L [April, 1945], 556). It is smaller than its predecessors and contains some materials to be found elsewhere, such as McLoughlin's long letter of November 20, 1845, first printed in the *American Historical Review* in 1915. But it is no less rich a source, biographically and historically.

The dominant theme of this volume continues that of the *Second Series*, 1839-44: McLoughlin's quarrel with Sir George Simpson, his immediate superior. This quarrel, intensified by the strongly opinionated natures of the two men, originated in a disagreement over company policy in the Columbia district and was brought to a head when Simpson did not prosecute the murderers of McLoughlin's son to his satisfaction. Subsequent events, revealed in this final volume, such as the failure of the post at Yerba Buena, the suicide of its chief officer, William Glen Rae, who was McLoughlin's son-in-law, and the conflict of policies and procedures over problems arising from the American settlement, afforded further opportunities for mutual recrimination.

McLoughlin was not exaggerating, when, in 1841, he wrote, "I have Drunk and am Drinking the cup of Bitterness to the very Dregs" (p. 166). He was increasingly criticized for his administration of company policy as he understood it. At times his interpretations of instructions and the reasons he gave to justify his actions could be called nothing better than muddled; but the company itself, and the officers who spoke for it, were not, insofar as these letters indicate, any clearer in their long-range plans. McLoughlin was deprived of the governorship of the district, relieved of the extra compensation the office carried, and maneuvered into a position of having to choose either to abandon a heavy investment in land claims at Oregon City and continue in the service as factor in another district, or to retire to the status of a private individual and try to maintain his claims. The alternative was hardly made more palatable to his pride when, upon his

choosing to retire, the company generously decided not to charge him for the bad loans he had made to the Americans. In McLoughlin's eyes, these loans had been made to maintain peace and to circumvent ill will. If his employers did not fully realize the situation, James Douglas' opinion should have enlightened them: "No people can be more prejudiced and national than the Americans in this country, a fact so evident to my mind, that I am more suspicious of their designs, than of the wild natives of the forest" (p. 190). McLoughlin was caught between the ebb of one empire and the flow of another.

Retirement was but the beginning of another bitter phase of his life. He was a proud man, and, as a private individual, he was to experience for the first time the leveling processes of an American frontier community, little respectful of personal dignity or of overlarge claims to strategically located lands. His generosity and excellences were overlooked, and it was remembered only that he was a "monopolist," a Catholic, and a Britisher.

The Americans, who, in 1850, deprived McLoughlin of his claims, restored them in 1862. In the following years their descendants were instrumental in building up the McLoughlin "story." "Legend has tended to exaggerate McLoughlin's stature, and to make him an incredible paragon of all the virtues," says Mr. Lamb in the concluding paragraph of his introduction. And this is so. Dr. John McLoughlin, the "White-headed Eagle," the "Patriarch of the Northwest," the "Good Doctor," the "Father of Oregon," has become Oregon's only hero of any dimension. He has been proposed for the Hall of Fame; his career occupies a large part of the region's history texts. The development of the legend has been part of a local hunger for history that can be recounted in terms of the great man. The idea of a struggle to save Oregon for the Union had been largely a manifestation of expansionist hysteria; in sober British and American thought there was no question as to the final outcome. The anglophobia of the forties and fifties was, in the Oregon country, an expression of an old tradition, accentuated by a local economic situation. When this situation was eased, McLoughlin emerged as the local hero. It is not an insignificant factor in the growth of the legend that Oregon, which has particularly stressed the cult, has been strongly anglophile since the latter part of the century. It is also true that McLoughlin, a courageous, generous, and humane man, has appealed to the sympathies of this western community. But it is equally true, and suggestive, that, without him, the Pacific Northwest would have had to elevate for its hero a type rather than an individual. With all respect to the solid virtues of the majority of its pioneers, there was among them no single person more colorful, more respectably orthodox in principle and behavior.

In the introductions to these three volumes, Mr. W. Kaye Lamb has given a most balanced account of the man's life and career with the Hudson's Bay Company. It is hoped that he will be prevailed upon to enlarge his theme and publish



a biography that will have a wider circulation than these volumes can have. No one is better prepared for the task than Mr. Lamb.

*Reed College*

DOROTHY O. JOHANSEN

ROCHESTER, THE WATER-POWER CITY, 1812-1854. By *Blake McKelvey*, Assistant City Historian, Rochester, New York. [Rochester Public Library, Kate Gleason Fund Publications, Number 1.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. xvi, 383. \$4.00.)

THE task of the scholarly historian in writing municipal history is a difficult one. He must first satisfy those local groups who are interested in such minutiae as the successive locations of the First National Bank or the First Methodist Church, and the establishment of the "first families" of the community. Then, if his work is to have more than local and antiquarian value and interest, the historian must place the story of his city in its broader regional and even national setting and show the interplay between local and larger forces and the effect of one upon the other. Effecting a balance between these two aims is the more difficult when one is dealing with the beginnings of a city, for the nature of the sources and the relative smallness of the subject make for a use of detail, which is impossible in the later history of a community and which sometimes serves to obscure the pattern of development.

Dr. McKelvey has been, in the main, successful in giving proper heed to these two sometimes conflicting aims. His history of Rochester from 1812 to 1854 has its share of "firsts," and due attention is paid to those early residents who contributed their efforts to building the new community on the banks of the Genesee River. But he also accords proper emphasis to the geographic factors in the development of Rochester: its location in the pathway of the westward movement, its use of the falls of the Genesee as a source of power for a flourishing milling industry, and its good fortune in profiting from the location of the Erie Canal. The New England background of those who constituted the first population of Rochester is also emphasized as an important factor in the determination of social and political attitudes.

If at times these patterns have not emerged as clearly as might be desired, a somewhat involved style and an undue reverence for the chronological approach must bear the major part of the blame. The first seven chapters are organized on a purely chronological basis, and, in most of these, the author moves from economic to political to religious, social, and cultural themes within a narrow time span. The later chapters present a more topical approach and cover a longer interval of time, with the result that the reader is made more aware of the developmental aspects of the story.

Dr. McKelvey has obviously done a thorough job of research. The copious

footnotes reveal the investigation of a wide variety of sources, of which the most important are letters, diaries, and other manuscripts, local newspapers, city government publications, and numerous studies published by the Rochester Historical Society. Illustrations, including early maps of the region, pictures of the town in its younger days, and portraits of the early citizens add to the attractiveness of a well-edited and well-printed book.

It is to be hoped that Dr. McKelvey will continue his study of Rochester, for the first volume hints at the beginnings of new developments—such as the coming of immigrant groups, the diversification of industry, and the impact of railroad building—which would make a sequel rewarding to anyone interested in the development of upstate New York.

*University of Connecticut*

DOROTHY CULP

THE SOUTH CAROLINA RICE PLANTATION AS REVEALED IN THE PAPERS OF ROBERT F. W. ALLSTON. Edited by *J. H. Easterby*, Professor of History, College of Charleston. [The American Historical Association, Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. xxi, 478. \$5.00.)

This volume furnishes the best picture of the problems and practices of ante-bellum rice planting that has been put into print. The portion of the papers of the Allston family of South Carolina herein contained indicates that as a whole they constitute not only the largest but as well the most important body of manuscript material on the subject now known to exist.

The outstanding member of the family was Robert Francis Withers Allston, whose papers constitute the greater part of the book. Of the fifth generation of the family in South Carolina, he was a graduate of West Point but remained in the Army only about a year, resigning to engage in rice planting, which he continued until his death in 1864. Deeply interested in public affairs, he served for four years as state surveyor general and then sat in the legislature for twenty-eight years. He was elected governor in 1856 and served two terms. An intense adherent to state rights doctrine, he joined the nullification movement, was a delegate to the Nashville Convention of 1850, contributed to the movement to send slave-holders to Kansas, and favored secession in 1860.

He was, however, far from being a reactionary. His progressive spirit was manifested in plans for public education, reform of the poor laws, relief of the deaf and dumb, the blind, and the insane, and for agricultural improvement. He deserved fully the description of him by his wife, born Adele Petigru, as "strong and able . . . full of resources, an active mind and clear judgment." James L. Petigru, never given to idle commendation, wrote of him as "combining more than anyone else, prudence with the other cardinal virtues."

Allston in the course of time acquired seven plantations, and from time to

time controlled others. The most important were Chicora Wood and Nightingale Hall. It is with these plantations that the book is chiefly concerned.

The volume is a most important contribution to the history of ante-bellum Southern agriculture, but it is much more than that. As a social document, touching upon family life, plantation economics, the relation of the family with the Negroes, with sidelights upon education, politics, the Civil War, and Reconstruction, it is equally significant.

Mr. Easterby has performed his editorial task excellently. He begins with an adequate and interesting introduction in which he discusses the nature and scope of the papers, describes the Allston family and its plantations in the Georgetown district, the various overseers and their work, the Negroes, and the economics of the system. Then follow 204 family letters of various sorts, 125 overseers' letters and other documents, 22 highly valuable slave documents, 121 factors' letters, and 11 miscellaneous documents which include such items as a list of the contents of the wine cellar at Chicora Wood, remarks by Allston on the free school system of the state, a speech by him on the Nashville Convention, a short diary kept by him in 1859-1860, and a statement of salt production during the Civil War. A good index completes the volume.

*University of North Carolina*

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

A HOUSE DIVIDING: LINCOLN AS PRESIDENT ELECT. By *William E. Baringer*. (Springfield, Ill.: Abraham Lincoln Association. 1945. Pp. ix, 356. \$4.00.)

THIS interesting monograph has an unfortunate title. Aside from two short chapters, it contains little that relates directly to the house-dividing crisis of 1860-1861. As attention is concentrated almost exclusively upon the struggle over the formation of Lincoln's cabinet, it might better have been called *Abraham Lincoln and the cabinetmakers*. Upon that topic it brings to light much new and significant information.

An unusually large amount of research has gone into the preparation of the volume. Few writers upon the period have sought out and read letters written in 1860-1861 as extensively as Mr. Baringer has done. Practically all the more considerable collections in the leading manuscript repositories have been explored. Quite a number of less extensive repositories have also been utilized. The amount of manuscript material that has been employed is impressive. The use of newspaper files, though less extensive, has been considerable. The leading papers of New York City, Washington, Springfield, Chicago, and St. Louis have been well utilized.

In presenting the results of his industry Mr. Baringer has fallen somewhat below the high level of his research. The period with which he deals, from election day in 1860 to March 4, 1861, is one which calls upon the historian for the

exercise of the utmost caution as to the character of the evidence he will accept. He needs to be particularly cautious about *ex post facto* evidence and that of hostile witnesses. He needs also to bear in mind that strictly contemporaneous evidence often represents guesses rather than actual knowledge. In numerous instances Mr. Baringer is not sufficiently cautious. The extent to which he relies upon the later testimony of Gideon Welles, Thurlow Weed, L. E. Chittenden, and various memoir writers is to be regretted. Such evidence is of dubious value.

Mr. Baringer presents the results of his research in a narrative made up in large degree of quotations and paraphrases drawn from the material upon which he relies. He is rather chary about drawing conclusions. Unfortunately when he does so, they are often linked up with the quotations and paraphrases in such a way that the reader cannot readily distinguish one from the other.

As in duty bound, the reviewer has endeavored to point out the defects of the book. He desires, however, to be understood as holding that the merits more than outweigh the defects. It is a valuable contribution to knowledge about the much misunderstood eve of the Civil War.

*Dartmouth College*

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON

WAR YEARS WITH JEB STUART. By *Lieut.-Colonel W. W. Blackford, C.S.A.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1945. Pp. xiii, 322. \$3.00.)

*War Years with Jeb Stuart* is a volume of Civil War reminiscences written in the 1890's by an officer in the Confederate Army. William W. Blackford enlisted in the First Regiment of Virginia Cavalry under the command of Lieutenant Colonel J. E. B. Stuart in 1861. He fought with Stuart's cavalry until 1864, at which time he became a member of the newly created First Regiment Engineer Troops. Blackford was a civil engineer by profession, having been well trained for that work before the war began. He was appointed adjutant on the battlefield at First Manassas and rose in rank, finally being made lieutenant colonel on April 1, 1864. The author took part in most of the important battles of the war and was present at Appomattox when Lee surrendered.

Blackford was opposed to secession, as were many of his contemporaries, but he was loyal to his native state of Virginia when she joined the Confederacy. At first, the army was anything but pleasant; war was a horrible ordeal, and the thought of killing his fellow men made life miserable. However, he soon learned the art of war and became an excellent combat soldier. He had several narrow escapes from death, though his only wound of the war came during a skirmish several days before the Battle of Fredericksburg. A musket ball penetrated his leg, but the wound was not severe enough to compel him to leave the field. "With three horses hit under me and about a dozen bullets through my clothes and accoutrements, two of my friends hit while I was talking to them, and three

other men shot down at my side, it is strange that I should have escaped with this slight reminder of the war" (p. 183).

There are several things about Blackford's story that impress the reader. The first is his affection and respect for Jeb Stuart. It is excelled only by the devotion he held for his wife and four children. Blackford was a great admirer of Robert E. Lee also, but, on the other hand, his dislike for Jefferson Davis and the Confederate government was unsurpassed. Another of his special dislikes was West Pointers. He believed that they always knew much less than they professed to know about fighting.

The entire story is woven around the military career of Jeb Stuart and might, therefore, be classified as military biography. The battles, sieges, and raids are all described in vivid and realistic detail. All students of Civil War history, especially those who are interested in military figures, will find this work to their liking, for it is among the best of its kind.

The introduction is written by Douglas Southall Freeman, who attests the authenticity of the work.

*University of Georgia*

S. WALTER MARTIN

ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO. By *Herbert Aptheker*. (New York: International Publishers. 1945. Pp. viii, 216. \$2.00.)

THE thesis of Mr. Herbert Aptheker's volume *Essays in the History of the American Negro* is set forth on the jacket of the book as "the struggle of the Negro people for emancipation during the main epochs of their country's history." The author states that "the desire for freedom is the central theme, the motivating force, in the history of the American negro people."

He presents considerable evidence that the Negro slaves from the seventeenth century to the end of the Civil War were frequently, if not constantly, involved in revolt; that they played an important part in the American Revolution, both as fighting men for the Revolution and as refugees escaping from American owners into British lines; that they and the free Negro of the North were the original organizers and the moving force in the abolition crusade; and that the Negro was not only a crucial factor in forcing wartime federal emancipation but militarily was an important factor in the defeat of the Confederacy.

These are broad claims and the author by no means substantiates all of his conclusions. But he has rendered a service in sharply calling attention to an aspect of American history which has been neglected. It is regrettable that specific footnote references to sources of information are not set forth in the volume. Sound historical conclusions must be based on evidence and the quality of the source evidence profoundly affects the validity of the conclusions.

Probably the most significant of these essays is the first, "Negro Slave Revolts." Mr. Aptheker states that since the sixteenth century there were more than 250

such revolts within what is now the United States and that more than 150 came after 1800. In fact, he says that between 1800 and 1864 there were outbreaks in from one to six slaveholding states during fifty-six out of the sixty-four years. It is open to question whether some of the revolts cited are correctly defined—as, for example, the attack by troops on certain outlaw communities within Spanish Florida and the Florida border during 1816 and later, when some three hundred Negroes were vaguely reported killed. The total aggregate loss of life, as set forth by the author, was less than eight hundred, including the Florida incidents. This is bad enough—but in the cold light of those times and of the sixty years intervening and of statistics it hardly indicates what the author wants it to indicate—namely, that the South was seething with insurrection and that the Negro slaves were seeking liberty or death. It means that possibly an average of one slave in 200,000 each year lost his life through revolt. How does this compare with the record of capital punishment, posses, and mobs in the free sections of the country?

But statistics are usually unconvincing to moralists—and Mr. Aptheker is a moralist. Southern slavery was obviously slavery—then and always a repressive and fundamentally a brutal system of regimentation. Many slaves—most of them, maybe—wanted to be free and many gained their freedom one way or another. The Southern white people of the nineteenth century found this archaic system fastened on them and their way of life increasingly interlocked with a larger system of expanding industrialism and markets beyond the South. The author makes this clear. Apparently, he justifies insurrections, arson, and murder to change the system. To him the end justified the means—which is questionable morality. The Southern white man—slaveholder and nonslaveholder—struck back not only to save his property but to save his life and the lives of his women and children.

Mr. Aptheker raises several interesting questions relative to the ante-bellum South and the Negro problem there. Space in this review forbids any detailed examination of the questions raised. He seems obsessed by an idea that slaveholders (and some of their descendants) constituted a conspiratorial class of great power and highly organized, almost diabolical, efficiency. He infers that the Southern poor white was an ally of the slaves and wanted them freed; that the slaveholders carefully nursed “a policy of division between the poor whites and the slaves on the basis of race hatred”; that the slaveholders cunningly separated house servants from field hands to curb revolts; that the slave states were militarisms under constant patrol by slaveholders; that in the ante-bellum South “any sort of freedom—of speech, press, religion, petition, assembly—was a shadow”; that the South was only a great prison; that the Southern white man (“Bourbon”) in writing the history of Negro slavery has committed “every sin of omission, falsification, and distortion.”

Such inferences, opinions, and conclusions are not supported by the mass of fact. Some of them are silly. At best they are gross exaggerations based on omissions and distortion.



Mr. Aptheker writes well and bitterly. He drags in Karl Marx more than once, although Marx knew little about the Negro slave in America. His brief reference to the John Brown episode is an apology for Brown's failure, and apparently he does not know Brown's purpose or that Brown was a scoundrel, given to embezzlement, robbery, murder, and plotting treason long before Harper's Ferry. He indulges in picturesque epithets ("lords of the lash," "slaveocrats," etc.) in referring to slaveholders—suggestive of Hinton Rowan Helper—which dates him and does not add to his stature as a historian. He exaggerates the military part played by the Negro in the Civil War. He states, for example, that 37,000 Negro soldiers in the Union Army were "killed in action." According to Mr. Kirkley, the statistician of the federal War Department, some 67,000 Union soldiers were "killed in action." Is it reasonable to suppose that more than fifty per cent of Union losses were borne by Negro troops? All told, all Negro troops in the Union armies were little more than one tenth of the total number of Union soldiers.

But in spite of exaggeration, bitterness, and some mistakes in quoted fact, Mr. Aptheker has written an interesting, stimulating, and worth-while book. He blazes the way, I think, toward a better evaluation of the Negro in American history.

*University of Kansas*

W. W. DAVIS

PAPERS RELATING TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES: THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE, 1919. Volume XI. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1945. Pp. xxix, 736. \$2.00.)

VOLUME XI of the *Papers* contains the minutes of the meetings of the American commissioners plenipotentiary, and of the commissioners and technical advisers of the American delegation at Paris, from January 31 to October 9, 1919; the minutes of the meetings of the steering committee from July 1 to September 4, 1919; and other papers relating to the composition, organization, and activities of the American delegation. A chart of organization of the commission accompanies the miscellaneous papers. The volume is indexed and part of the minutes is provided with helpful inset headings.

The commissioners met daily except on Sundays and occasional Saturdays. President Wilson did not attend the meetings, and Colonel House seldom was present. There is but one report of a meeting between the President and the commissioners; this was attended also by the technical advisers; its purpose was to obtain opinions upon the German counterproposals to the terms of peace. It is fully reported and the report is much more informative than those of the meetings of the commissioners, in which the minutes are limited to memorandums, statements, and decisions. Only less valuable are the several full reports of meetings between the commissioners and advisers without the President. The procedure at meetings of the commissioners was to present questions, with accompanying

memorandums, on printed forms containing spaces for the opinion of each commissioner and for the final decision. The questions and memorandums are not printed. Unfamiliar circumstances and the persons involved in them are referred to without footnotes. Liaison with the Council of Ten was maintained through oral reports by attachés and through personal conversations of the several commissioners with members of other delegations. There are numerous statements by special investigators but very few by pleaders for special causes.

The matters dealt with by the commissioners were numerous and diverse. No consecutive pattern of discussion emerges from the minutes. Many subjects of small importance, related to organization and personnel, were permitted to invade the meetings. Arthur Sweetser's salary came up three times; on another occasion the commissioners approved employment of a lieutenant for three hours a day at four francs an hour. Samuel Gompers was refused the use of two Cadillac cars for a trip to Brussels but subsequently Secretary-General Grew's authorization of their use was "highly approved." One would prefer to have had the unprinted memorandums in place of the many inconsequential items of this nature, and wonders why the latter might not have been left to the decision of the large administrative staff.

While it is difficult to appraise the contribution of the commissioners because of the lack of stenographic minutes of their discussions it is apparent that many matters of primary importance were dealt with by them. They appear to have worked together in harmony and no one of them seems inclined to score at the others' expense. They felt the need of haste and were worried by events in Russia and the United States more than by reports from Germany. No significant new facts are disclosed in the volume but there are many tidbits of diplomatic gossip. Very little space is allotted to the Shantung question, but the feeling of the commissioners was expressed by Mr. Lansing when he said that "this was the time for us to have it out once and for all with Japan." President Wilson wished to send Charles R. Crane and Henry C. King as field observers to Syria "because they knew nothing about it."

The steering committee was established late, holding its first meeting on July 1, 1919. It consisted of varying numbers of technical advisers and experts under the chairmanship of James Brown Scott, and held twenty-one meetings to deal with matters of procedure. It was of signal assistance in relation to the form and phraseology of the treaties and determination of the proper signatory states. Among the miscellaneous papers the most interesting are those that embody the comments of Mr. Lansing upon the terms of the treaty with Germany (reprinted from his *Peace Negotiations*), and the proffered resignations of Messrs. Berle, Bullitt, Fuller, Morison, Noble, and Storck in protest against the terms. Mr. Fuller epitomizes all the letters as well as Mr. Lansing's memorandum in his sentence: "Instead of assuring the peace of the world by a just reconstitution, this treaty seeks guarantees for a settlement in favor of the victors which reduces the

vanquished to powerless and indefinite servitude." Mr. Noble writes, "I have found that my feelings are echoed by a surprisingly large number of persons connected with the American Commission." These letters read strangely today.

*University of Minnesota*

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY

PAPERS RELATING TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1930. Three volumes. [Department of State Publication 2229.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1945. Pp. lxxv, 564; xciii, 797; xc, 904. Vol. I, \$1.75; Vols. II and III, \$2.25 each.)

WAY down in the bottom of the State Department an unheralded group of faithful public servants slowly but steadily prepares for publication annually a selection of diplomatic correspondence and documents illustrative of American foreign relations fifteen years ago. The crew at present consists of Messrs. George V. Blue, jr., Philip M. Burnet, Victor J. Farrar, and George Gilbert Reid, working under the editorial supervision of Mr. E. Wilder Spaulding. Year after year the editor of the *American Historical Review*, high up in the Library of Congress Annex, receives the reviews of these multiplying volumes. Annually they get less and less attention per volume, because the volumes multiply and space holds comment shorter and shorter. This year there are three fat volumes again. As usual, Volume I consists mostly of general international activities.

The year 1930 was the last twelve months of the peace idyl. The United States was still persisting in its effort for international naval disarmament. It succeeded in the London Conference in extending the ten-year Washington capital ship ratio until 1936 and in bringing in new limitations on auxiliary ships. We had long since demobilized our mighty World War armies. The United States regular army of 1930 consisted of 137,645 men and officers, the National Guard of 182,700, a force less than that of the smallest European nation. We were still trying to get the powers of the Old World to follow our example. Volume I records the last session of the (Geneva) Preparatory Commission on Disarmament. Forty-five per cent of the documents in Volume I deal with these general international affairs, including such an item as the Bank of International Settlement. The remainder is mostly Latin America and Canada. The greater part of the documents on Latin-American countries deal with revolutions ("changes in government," as the State Department publicity release, for these volumes, euphemistically puts it), and boundary disputes (Chaco, Guatemala-Honduras, Honduras-Nicaragua). The Latin-American material extends into Volumes II and III to take up about thirty per cent of their contents too, leaving seventy per cent to Europe and Asia.

For the reader in this year of grace, 1946, the atmosphere of peace of 1930 becomes surcharged with preparations for war when we reach Germany. It is the "lull before the storm," as the publicity release puts it. (For an extended review, in some 2,500 words, of this publication, by two of the editors, see Department

of State *Bulletin*, XXIII [July 22, 1945], 118-24.) First reports are now coming in of the Nazi program, reports to which the Roosevelt administrations for a long time paid so little attention. "There can be no doubt that last Sunday's vote," reported the chargé in Berlin, George A. Gordon, anent the impressive strength shown by the Nazis in the *Reichstag* elections of September, 1930, "was another overpowering example of Germany's lack of political education and wisdom and form of Government. . . . The body-blow is not necessarily a knock-out, but the danger is clearly there, and cannot be lightly overlooked or explained away." Nevertheless the State Department allowed American loans to pour in to Germany.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the editor in chief has done well to reprint in the preface to Volume I the department rules of 1925 which control the process of selection. It is the practice to print substantially complete files, aside from inconsequential and trivial details, on the subjects selected. Omitted subjects are explained as: matters which if published at this time would tend to embarrass negotiations "or other business"; omissions necessary to preserve the confidence of governments and individuals; materials which would give needless offense to other governments or individuals; personal opinions, except sometimes where desirable for the explanation of major decisions; subjects to which a foreign government is not willing to give consent for publication.

These rules compel the omission of much important matter, perhaps the most important. Still there are three volumes of rather important documents. The historical scholar ought not to complain too much that a lot has to be left out. If all were published, then we would not have the fun and thrill years hence of turning up important secrets in manuscript records long since forgotten.

*Yale University*

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

ORIGINS OF INTER-AMERICAN INTEREST, 1700-1812. By *Harry Bernstein*, Brooklyn College, New York. [Prepared and published under the direction of the American Historical Association from the income of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1945. Pp. ix, 125. \$2.00.)

ENGLISHMEN in North America have from their own beginnings taken active part in the affairs of Latin America. They have done so whether or not they had permission from their mother country, or the consent of Portugal or Spain. They have ignored even the wishes of their neighbors in the West Indies, Mexico, the Isthmus, and South America. Though he puts it in more diplomatic language, this is the burden of Mr. Bernstein's little book. He has accumulated and analyzed in support of it a great amount of evidence from the period 1700-1812.

The chapters are arranged in topical rather than chronological order. The first three are concerned with the European contest for the New World, the trade of Britain's colonies prior to their revolt, and inter-American trade after the ap-

pearance of the United States. These chapters make clear that North American merchantmen profitably made their way around the Spanish Caribbean in war or peace, whether trafficking in contraband or in smuggled goods, and that the business was complicated by rivalry with Jamaica, the discrimination of England, and Spain's competition with her own colonies for North American cargoes. Conditions were simplified, but only to a degree, when the United States became independent and their neutral cargoes fair game for British sea power during the Napoleonic Wars.

This commercial intercourse with Latin America had its cultural and political accompaniment. Chapters iv and v relate the interchange of scientific ideas and memberships in learned societies; the importations of books, pamphlets, tracts, and historical literature; the efforts to create political ties, and particularly the enthusiasms of certain North Americans for spreading their institutions into South America. For instance, Samuel Sewall and Cotton Mather of Boston looked to the day when the "American Spaniards" might come into hemispheric religious unity—Protestant, of course. And there were others later with much the same purposes, though expressed in more secular terms. There still are. Mr. Bernstein is quite right in asserting that precedents for the present were established in the origins of inter-American interest. The Chilean Padre Martinez scored the "Bostonese Republic" for endeavoring "to enlarge its small size and extend its system." What might he say now, if he were alive to hear about hemispheric solidarity in conjunction with the activity in Chile's ore fields of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation?

The author has selected for his intensive study materials which have to do with the enterprises of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia because he feels that they made the "pattern" of the whole subject. There is no need, in his judgment, to investigate the records of other seaboard communities, such as Baltimore and Charleston, in order to determine qualitatively the nature of "Inter-American Interest." For the same reason, he does not think it necessary to discuss the purposes and actions of frontiersmen in Florida, Louisiana, and the Southwest; besides, they have already been examined elsewhere. The reader consequently will not find here a fully qualitative analysis of the North American attitude toward Latin America. So at least it seems to this reviewer. For in his opinion, the land-grabbing of western pioneers was something rather different from the profit-seeking of eastern merchants, though it is true their disdain for Spaniards and Indians was common.

Like so many historical monographs, one's own included, this is too closely packed for easy reading and proper assimilation. There is also the tendency to bury in the footnotes much that is significant and entertaining. The book would be more effective if it were twice as long.

*Andover, Massachusetts*

ARTHUR B. DARLING

LITERARY CURRENTS IN HISPANIC AMERICA. By *Pedro Henríquez-Ureña*. [The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures, 1940-1941.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. vi, 345, \$3.50.)

THIS notable work comes from the pen of one of Latin America's most distinguished scholars. It will enhance his reputation still further and should prove a boon to teachers of college courses in this country on the general history as well as the literature of Latin America. Its two main virtues are, first, that it combines synthesis and interpretation with an abundance of pertinent detail, and, second, that it projects the literary history of Latin America against a background of political, economic, social, and artistic development, with some attention to foreign (particularly French) influences. All this, covering a period of four and a half centuries from the discovery of America to 1940, is packed into two hundred pages of text and eighty pages of notes (plus an eight-page bibliography and a forty-page index)—truly a masterpiece of condensation.

In order to achieve this masterpiece the author has, of course, had to apply rigorous rules of selection and exclusion. While the result has been happy in the main, many things have been omitted that one might have expected to find in a work of this kind. For one thing, the opening chapter arouses an expectation which is not fulfilled: it describes the European impression of America formed in the first century after the discovery; but subsequent chapters do not describe the great changes that this impression underwent at a later time. Again, the final chapter, "Problems of Today: 1920-1940," is disappointingly meager. It not only omits such eminent figures as José Vasconcelos (who appears only in the notes), but it also fails to develop such general themes as the stream of German literary and philosophical influence which poured into Latin America through Spain, and the rise of *Hispanidad* and its Latin-American national affiliates, such as *Argentinidad* and *Peruanidad*. In this connection, it is characteristic that while the author mentions in a note the Argentine Ricardo Rojas' two books *La restauración nacionalista* (1909) and *La Argentinidad* (1916), he does not point out their connection with the current ultra-nationalism in Argentina, which, like so many other features of the recent cultural scene in Latin America, is not illuminated by this book. Finally, the book does not justify the publisher's claim that it is a "cultural survey," even if this term is understood in the narrower intellectual and artistic sense rather than in the broader anthropological sense. For example, although universities and learned societies have strongly influenced the intellectual development of Latin America, the former are discussed in these pages with extreme brevity and the latter are barely mentioned.

It would be unjust, however, to stress the shortcomings of a book which has so many important merits. It is above all a thoughtful book, and there is hardly a page in it that does not contain at least one stimulating observation. These are bound together by a consistent pattern of thought in which the three main urges



underlying Latin-American literary expression appear to have been, first, a desire to promote the public welfare; second, the antithetical "ivory tower" complex; and third, preoccupation with the problem of "expressing Latin America." The author himself is very sympathetic toward the last-named theme, which he developed in a well-known work published nearly twenty years ago. Indeed, the Harvard lectures of which the present book is an outgrowth were first entitled "In Search of Expression." The author tells us that he subsequently thought best to change the title, and in this reviewer's opinion he was well advised to make the change.

Nevertheless, the original title did suggest an aspect of Latin-American literature that has been important throughout most of its history and which possesses the very greatest interest at the present time, when the foremost problem facing all peoples is that of establishing and maintaining world order. Another prominent Latin-American writer, Gilberto Freyre, has recently asserted that the study of political history tends to divide peoples, whereas the study of cultural history tends to unite them. The present book contains many proofs of the naiveté of this idea so far as Latin America is concerned; it could have furnished many more if the author had made a more searching examination of Latin-American cultural trends in the present century. It shows that the writers of Latin America (as of every other part of the world) are most particularistic and nationalistic precisely when they seek to "express" their native culture; it is a sharp reminder that whereas world organization at the political level is already a reality, the achievement of a world culture still lies in the incalculably remote future.

*University of Pennsylvania*

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER

## \* \* \* Other Recent Publications \* \* \*

### General History

THE STORY OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR. Edited with historical narrative by *Henry Steele Commager*. (Boston, Little, Brown, 1945, pp. 578, \$3.00.) "Here is the story of the war as it came to the American and the British people—as it looked and felt while the fighting was going on to those whose business or good fortune it was to be articulate about it." The character of Professor Commager's *The Story of the Second World War* is much more accurately indicated by the words just quoted from its preface than by its title. There is no story, only stories. Some coherence and logical or chronological sequence has been supplied by the editor's chronicle, but the war still swarms over and about the reader in the same bewildering confusion, and profusion, as it did in fact while it was happening. If this comment had been intended, as it is not, as destructive criticism, Professor Commager would be found to have disarmed it in advance by pointing out that, as editor, he has assembled a number of stories and statements about events by those who had participated in them or whose duty it was to record them. The final evaluation of the testimony here given and the writing of a systematic narrative account must wait until other evidence is available and someone has had time to study it. In the meantime, this is a useful compilation, finished in haste as the poor proofreading testifies. Probably the author sings the national anthem no better than the rest of us, but he should quote it correctly. CHESTER V. EASUM

THE WAR: FIFTH YEAR. By *Edgar McInnis*, Associate Professor of History, University of Toronto. With an Introduction by Field Marshal Sir Henry Maitland Wilson. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1945, pp. xv, 401, \$2.50.) The high standard of excellence already set by Professor McInnis in his history of the war is maintained in this fifth volume which covers, roughly, the period from October, 1943, through September, 1944. This is the year when the Red armies hurled the Germans out of Russia and forced Finland, Rumania, and Bulgaria to sue for peace; when the allies liberated Rome and pursued the Nazis north to the Gothic line; when they successfully breached the Atlantic wall and drove Hitler's forces back out of France and Belgium into the Reich; when, finally, they gained an undoubted air supremacy over the Continent. In view of these facts it is not surprising, perhaps, that eighty-five per cent of the narrative is concerned with developments in the West, and that only forty-five pages are devoted to the achievements of MacArthur, Nimitz, Mountbatten, and Stilwell in the Pacific and the Far East. The volume constitutes a notable contemporary report, analysis, integration, and interpretation of the military events of the war. In addition it includes an enlightening discussion of significant political and diplomatic developments, in the course of which, incidentally, the author reveals his dislike of Franco, "an avowed and implacable enemy of freedom," and his regret that Churchill should have extended to Franco his "gratuitous approval." F. LEE BENNS

TRADE UNION PUBLICATIONS: THE OFFICIAL JOURNALS, CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS, AND CONSTITUTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL UNIONS AND FEDERATIONS, 1850-1941. Volume I, DESCRIPTION AND BIBLIOGRAPHY; Volumes II and III, SUBJECT INDEX. By *Lloyd G. Reynolds*, Associate Professor of

Political Economy, and *Charles C. Killingsworth*, Instructor in Political Economy, The Johns Hopkins University. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1945, pp. xxxii, 416; lvii, 486; xv, 487-931, \$25.00.) Students of American trade unions will be grateful for the completion of this important work. Its major object is "to facilitate an increased flow of cross-sectional, generalizing studies" (I, 30). The work makes its major contribution in the index, in Volumes II and III, of the journals and convention proceedings of fifty carefully selected unions and federations, from their establishment through 1941. With some defined exceptions, all items of 500 words were indexed, under some 1,500 headings. Volume I gives a chronology and a bibliographical guide to union journals and convention proceedings for about 275 national and international unions. For each of the 50 unions indexed, a "Critique of Publications" is given, varying in length from one to nine pages. An essay on the content and uses of trade union publications (I, chap. 1) gives a valuable brief summary of the types of material included and of significant trends in union interest shown. In addition, it suggests many types of research problems for which union publications, with the aid of this index, will be useful. For the aid of the investigator there is a careful discussion of the methods used (I, chap. 11), and a list of unions, a list of the index headings, a glossary, and clear explanations of the reference system, publication symbols, etc. The index headings have been carefully developed and appear to be usable. On topics examined a rich range of references is given to varied unions and to publications from the earliest union history on. The "Critiques" which aim at objective description of the publications (I, 38-39), turn out to be brief summaries of union history as well as of the publications. The volumes will be an invaluable tool for investigators in this field. Few will read the introductory chapters or look over the bibliographies without wanting to start on the trail for answers to questions for which much valuable raw material has hitherto been lost in the pages of the documents here indexed. The documents are available in at least one of four major libraries listed and are noted in the *Union List of Serials*.

EMILY CLARK BROWN

AN OUTLINE OF MISSIONS. By *John Aberly*. (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1945, pp. 306, \$3.50.) The author of this exceedingly able work was, for a third of a century (1889-1923), an American Lutheran missionary in India and, more recently, has served on the faculty of the Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Students of social history have long been familiar with his several volumes in the religious field written in Telugu. This book will, of course, reach a far wider audience. Professor Aberly's *Outline* is based upon his exceedingly popular lecture course and was written primarily for young seminarists. It will, however, enjoy much more general use and will prove of particular value to students of modern imperialism and to sociologists because it is the first scholarly portrayal of this vital subject in textbook form. Notably free from sectarian distortion, Professor Aberly's narrative is a straightforward portrayal of the factors leading to Christian expansion, its humble beginnings, its steady progress and its spread to the utmost corners of the earth through adaptability to environment and circumstance. The second part, surveying activities in specific theaters of operation such as Africa, Malaya, and Oceanica, will be found of particular value. Emphasis is placed upon education as an integral part of mission enterprise and is held to explain much of its success. The author believes that, because of the rise of nationalist sentiment, future missionary activity in outlying areas must rest upon indigenous foundations and that, in this situation, the current trend towards freeing foreign denominational groups from European or American control is a first step in the direction of brilliant achievement.

LOWELL RAGATZ

**THE FALLING SICKNESS: A HISTORY OF EPILEPSY FROM THE GREEKS TO THE BEGINNINGS OF MODERN NEUROLOGY.** By *Ousei Temkin*, Associate Professor of the History of Medicine at The Johns Hopkins University. (Publications of the Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, First Series: Monographs, Volume IV.) (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1945, p. xv, 380, \$4.00.) This monograph represents a scholarly study of the writings of physicians, philosophers, and theologians from antiquity through the third quarter of the nineteenth century insofar as these pertain to epilepsy, "the falling sickness." It is a veritable epitome of mankind's pathetically futile attempts to explain and control his bodily and mental afflictions without access to the data of science and without benefit of the scientific method. It begins with a critical review of the oldest known monograph on epilepsy, namely, the Hippocratic classic, "On the Sacred Disease," in which the author, a physician of ancient Greece, depicts for a lay audience the ever-present struggle between magicians, sorcerers, and charlatans on the one hand and the rational or scientific physicians of the time, on the other. It points out from these early records that the latter group came much nearer to our present-day concepts regarding the pathogenesis and treatment of this convulsive disorder than did most physicians of the Middle Ages, whose beliefs were deeply colored by the religious superstition and magic of the day. The book closes with a chapter on the contributions of Hughlings Jackson, which, together with those of the nineteenth century French neurologists, laid the groundwork for our present-day scientific approach to the study of the convulsive states. The concept of epilepsy as "the falling sickness," a designation which had long symbolized the confusion of medicine, magic, and superstition, disappeared with the advent of the scientific or experimental period. The book's orderly documentation with numerous references and well-selected quotations from original works gives it a character of reliability and completeness without detracting in the least from its fresh and energetic style. It could be read with profit by laymen as well as physicians and scholars who are specially interested in the history of science and in the story of man's emancipation from domination by religious superstition, wizardry, and charlatanism.

IRVINE MCQUARRIE, M.D.

**MAN AGAINST PAIN: THE EPIC OF ANESTHESIA.** By *Howard Riley Raper*. (New York, Prentice-Hall, 1945, pp. viii, 337, \$3.50.) The bitter controversy known in medical circles as the Wells-Morton-Long controversy as to who actually is to be credited with the discovery of anesthesia is here resolved in a well-written, lucid, logical discussion. Surely there is enough credit for all, since few, if any other, discoveries in the field of medicine have been of greater significance for the advancement of medical science and the saving of human lives. Dr. Raper traces every step in the development of anesthesia from the production of unconsciousness by a sharp blow on the head to our modern period when anesthesia has become a distinct specialty in medicine with its own certifying board and its own section in the American Medical Association. As to the controversy, there seems to be no doubt that Crawford Long first used ether for anesthesia in 1842 and published his first paper about it in 1849, that Horace Wells discussed the theory of anesthesia and put it to a test with nitrous oxide gas in 1844, and that William Thomas Green Morton introduced anesthesia scientifically in 1845, from which introduction there came the modern science of anesthesia as we know it today. Other names like those of Hickman, Jackson, J. Collins Warren, and Oliver Wendell Holmes belong in the picture—Holmes because he invented the word "anesthesia." The latter chapters of this book discuss new gases, new ethers, local and block anesthesia, spinal anesthesia, and the accomplishments of the

anesthetists in the war just ended. An extensive supplement provides a critical bibliography with condensations of early writings, and there is an excellent index. Dr. Raper tells his story well. In a subject that is essentially serious, he finds a humor that is inevitable in every human action and endeavor. His scientific approach to the subject, coupled with his ability to tell his story, makes this one of the very best books both for the professional and the general reader that has thus far been available.

MORRIS FISHBEIN, M.D.

**TWO HUNDRED FIFTY MILLION AND ONE SLAVS: AN OUTLINE OF SLAV HISTORY WITH MAPS AND ANNOTATIONS.** By *Vlaho S. Vlahovic*. Introduction by Joseph S. Roucek. (New York, Slav Publications, 1945, pp. 110, cloth \$3.00, paper \$2.00.) "A short history of the Slavic peoples of Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria."

**VOIX DE L'ORIENT: SOUVENIRS D'UN DIPLOMATE.** By *Jacques d'Aumale*, Ministre plénipotentiaire de France. (Montreal, Les Editions Variétés, 1945, pp. 318, \$1.75.) This volume is an account of the experiences and reflections of a French diplomat stationed in Egypt and Palestine from 1919 to 1937. Following an interesting introductory section describing his childhood near Abbeville, his education in Paris, and his preliminary diplomatic training at St. Petersburg, Constantinople, and the Quai d'Orsay, M. d'Aumale launches into his brilliant and charming exposé of life in Egypt, where he was stationed from 1919 to 1929. Without apparent political or sociological axes to grind, the author records, briefly but succinctly, events in Egyptian politics leading up to that country's independence and the Montreux Convention of 1936. This narration is, however, only a backdrop against which is shown a panorama of modern Egyptian life from the sumptuous receptions at the palace and the gay international and diplomatic gatherings to the life and role of the lowly fellah. Throughout the section on Egypt the one dominant strain, recurring time and again, is the significant place which France, Frenchmen, and French culture enjoy in every aspect of Egyptian life. M. d'Aumale follows the same pattern for his narrative on Palestine, to which he was transferred in 1929, beginning his story with a chronicle of the influence France has had there since the time of the Crusades. In regard to the Palestine problem, he says, in sum, that the history of Palestine from 1920 to 1940 is a resumé of the efforts of the British, Jews, and Arabs to "find a solution of an insoluble question created by the proclamation of irreconcilable principles." In a final chapter, describing a visit to the court of Emir Abdullah of Transjordan, the author presents an analysis of the possibilities of a federation of the Arab states, a revival of the Khalifat, and a more dominant position for Ibn Saud. Although containing considerable material of historical value, the book is written in a popular style which should appeal to anyone seeking an interesting account of the prewar life and society in Cairo and Jerusalem. Besides several insignificant errors, the main fault of the volume is the omission of a great deal of material which would indicate the political, economic, and social unrest developing in the Near East during those years of the author's residence there and at present rising to a point of compelling importance. With this exception, M. d'Aumale has captured here the "voix de l'Orient."

SYDNEY NETTLETON FISHER

**THE ARAB HERITAGE.** Edited by *Nabih Amin Faris*. By Philip K. Hitti, Giorgio Levi Della Vida, Julian Obermann, Gustave E. von Grunebaum, Nabih Amin Faris, John L. LaMonte, Henry L. Savage, Edward J. Jurji, and Richard Ettinghausen. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1944, pp. x, 279, \$3.00.) No one with a pro-

fessional interest in the Near East can fail to profit from a reading of this book by nine leading authorities on Arabic culture. Its essays are scholarly discussions of important facets of the Arab heritage. They give both factual information and interpretation about a significant but too little known civilization. Professor Hitti's introductory essay presents a succinct summary of Arab contributions to Western civilization and stresses the great importance of Islam in our day. His strong plea for wider study of Arabic culture in the United States should be read by every college curriculum planner in the country, for we are woefully ignorant of both past and present in this, one of the most significant areas of the world. But if college students and other laymen are to be inspired to an interest in this great culture, more readable books must be forthcoming. Unevenness of style is almost inevitable in a symposium of this sort but some of the dullness and poor organization might have been avoided. The materials, if presented in a more lucid and less technical way, would be extremely valuable for collateral study by college students and would be of interest to the general reader. A map of the Arabic world would have provided an important visual aid and a summarizing chapter, drawing together some of the major points stressed in the essays, would have given the book greater unity.

MAYBELLE KENNEDY CHAPMAN

THE AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK. Volume 47, 5706, 1945-46. Edited by *Harry Schneiderman* and *Julius B. Maller*. (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945, pp. xxx, 760, \$3.00.) This volume is similar in arrangement to its predecessors. (See *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLVII [July, 1942], 922, etc.) This issue has articles on "Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Jewish Crisis, 1933-1945," "Henrietta Szold, 1860-1945," and "French Jewry under the Occupation."

THE AXIS IN DEFEAT: A COLLECTION OF DOCUMENTS ON AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD GERMANY AND JAPAN. [Department of State, Publication 2423.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. v, 118, 30 cents.)

TRIAL OF WAR CRIMINALS. [Department of State, Publication 2420.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. 89, 20 cents.) Includes the following documents: Report of Robert H. Jackson to the President; Agreement Establishing an International Military Tribunal; Indictment.

RIVAL PARTNERS: AMERICA AND BRITAIN IN THE POSTWAR WORLD. By *Keith Hutchison*. (New York, Macmillan, 1946, pp. viii, 262, \$2.00.)

THE OUTLOOK FOR POSTWAR EUROPE. Lectures delivered under the auspices of the Committee on International Relations on the Los Angeles Campus of the University of California, Spring, 1944. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1945, pp. 160, cloth \$2.00, paper \$1.25.)

LIBRARY RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA: A SUMMARY OF FACILITIES FOR STUDY AND RESEARCH. Edited with a Foreword by *Charles E. Rush*, Director of Libraries. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1945, pp. x, 264, \$3.50.) "The volume contains an account of the history of the Library from its earliest accessions by gift during the first session of the University in 1795 to its present holdings of some half million volumes; details of its system of co-operation with neighboring institutions; descriptions of its distinctive collections—North Caroliniana, manuscripts relative to Southern history and culture, materials pertaining to Latin America, and documents illustrating the origin and development of writing and printing; descriptive summaries for study in special



fields; and an account of its services to the state through its Extension Division. The emphasis throughout is laid on the place of the Library in the University's promotion of culture and scholarship."

CORNELL UNIVERSITY ABSTRACTS OF THESES ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL SATISFACTION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTOR'S DEGREE, 1944, TO WHICH IS APPENDED A LIST OF TITLES OF THESES ACCEPTED IN 1944 FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE. (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1945, pp. 288, \$2.00.)

## ARTICLES

- CLARENCE P. GOULD. History—A Science? *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.  
 The Rosenwald Collection. *Lib. of Cong. Quar. Jour. of Current Acquisitions*, Oct.  
 MARTIN F. HASTING. Historians of Trent. *Hist. Bull.*, Jan.  
 GEORG SCHURHAMMER. Die Anfänge des Römischen Archivs der Gesellschaft Jesu, 1538–1548. *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, XII, 1943.  
 DIONISIO FERNÁNDEZ ZAPICO and PEDRO Y LETURIA. Cincuentenario de *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, 1894–1944. *Ibid.*, XIII, 1944.  
 GENEVIEVE PETERSON. Political Inequality at the Congress of Vienna. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Dec.  
 WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS. Human Rights in England and the United States. *Am. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, Jan.  
 CHARLES DE VISSCHER. Human Rights in Roman Law Countries. *Ibid.*  
 PAUL FREDERICK CRESSEY. Chinese Traits in European Civilization: A Study in Diffusion. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, Oct.  
 D. W. BROGAN. America and Britain, 1939–1946. *Yale Rev.*, Winter.  
 T. D. CLARK. Records of Little Businesses as Sources of Social and Economic History. *Bull. Bus. Hist. Soc.*, Nov.  
 Why Write Company Histories? *Ibid.*  
 Sixty-eighth Critical Bibliography of the History and Philosophy of Science and of the History of Civilization (to January 1945). *Isis*, XXXVI, pt. 1, no. 103.

Ancient History<sup>1</sup>

T. R. S. Broughton

## ARTICLES

- JOHN A. WILSON. The Assembly of a Phoenician City. *Jour. Near East. Stud.*, Oct.  
 SETON LLOYD and FUAD SAFAR. Tell Hassuna: Excavations by the Iraq Government Directorate General of Antiquities in 1943 and 1944. *Ibid.*  
 WILLIAM A. IRWIN. The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament. *Jour. Religion*, Oct.  
 A. S. YAHUDA. The Name of Balaam's Homeland. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, Oct.  
 HERBERT GORDON MAY. The Chronology of Jeremiah's Oracles. *Jour. Near East. Stud.*, Oct.  
 ROLAND G. KENT. Old Persian Texts. *Ibid.*  
 JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS. The Conciliar and Civil Calendar in I. G. I<sup>2</sup>, 324. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.  
 H. N. COUCH. Mistaken Identity in War. *Class. Jour.*, Oct.  
 E. BIKERMAN. Notes sur Polybe, II. *Rev. Etudes Grecques*, July-Dec. (1943).  
 HUGH LAST. The Servian Reforms. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXXV.  
 H. MATTINGLY. The First Age of Roman Coinage. *Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup>Under this and the following headings unsigned notices are, in general, contributed by the persons whose names appear at the heads of the divisions and who are otherwise responsible only for the lists of articles and documents.

- H. H. SCULLARD. Charops and Roman Policy in Epirus. *Ibid.*  
 PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER. Socrates Enters Rome. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.  
 GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. Vergil and War in the Aeneid. *Class. Jour.*, Dec.  
 J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR. Syrian Coin Hoards and the Tribute Question. *Anglican Theol. Rev.*, Oct.  
 H. ST. J. B. PHILBY. Three New Inscriptions from Hadhramaut. *Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, nos. 3-4, 1945.  
 I. A. RICHMOND. The Sarmatae, *Bremetennacum Veteranorum* and the *Regio Bremetennacensis*. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXXV.  
 Roman Britain in 1944. *Ibid.*  
 FELIX OSWALD. Decorated Ware from Lavoye. *Ibid.*  
 HAROLD INGRAMS. From Cana (Husn Ghorab) to Sabbatha (Shabwa): The South Arabian Incense Road. *Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, nos. 3-4, 1945.  
 HERBERT BLOCH. A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West. *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Oct.  
 HORACE ABRAM RIGG, JR. Barabbas. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, Dec.  
 ROBERT F. CASEY. Professor Goodenough and the Fourth Gospel [and Goodenough's reply]. *Ibid.*

## Medieval History

Bernard J. Holm

THOMISTIC BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1920-1940. By *Vernon Joseph Bourke*. [Supplement to Volume XXI.] (St. Louis, Modern Schoolman, St. Louis University, 1945, pp. 320, cloth \$3.00, paper \$2.50.) "A compilation of works by and on St. Thomas of Aquinas and his school, for the chronological period sequent to the Mandonnet-Destrez 'Bibliography.'"

BISHOP REGINALD PECOCK: A STUDY IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND THOUGHT. By *V. H. H. Green*, formerly Scholar of Trinity Hall, and Lightfoot Scholar of the University of Cambridge; Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury; Assistant Master at Sherborne School. (Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. viii, 261, \$3.00.) For a man who was active in ecclesiastical and political affairs in England during some three decades—a bishop, privy counselor, and prolific writer—curiously little is known of the life of Reginald Pecock. What there is has been pieced together in this little volume which constitutes the first full-length portrait of the bishop since Lewis published his biography a century and a quarter ago. By previous authors he has been linked with Wycliffe as a precursor of the Reformation, characterized as a defender of ultramontane principles, pictured as an early exponent of seventeenth and eighteenth century rationalism, or considered as an "enlightened advocate of toleration in times peculiarly intolerant," largely in accordance with the confessional predilection of the one who pronounces the judgment. In the present work, the author has attempted, more clearly and fully than had previously been done, to relate his subject to the times in which he lived and to provide a more objective interpretation of his work and influence than has hitherto appeared. Mr. Green divides his book into fifteen chapters, in the first six of which he sketches what is known of the external facts of Pecock's life, from his student days at Oxford to his seclusion in the abbey of Thorney in 1459, where he seems to have died a year or two thereafter. The author has done a workmanlike job, and the volume constitutes a welcome addition to the monographic literature on the cultural history

of fifteenth century England. There is a bibliography and a brief index. It is a book for the student, since neither the subject nor the treatment will be likely to attract a large number of readers. And yet there was enough of drama in Pecock's career. A defender of the clergy against their detractors and an effective critic of Lollardry, he was none the less haled before the archbishop's court in 1457 to answer charges of heresy, following an attack upon him by his lay colleagues at a council held a few weeks previously. After a hearing, he was given the narrow choice of recantation or death by burning. Consonant with his expressed principles of submission to authority, he chose the former alternative and retracted seven specific erroneous tenets, which were attributed to him but three of which contradict positions which he is known from his extant works to have held. As Babington remarks in his introduction to *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*, Pecock's most considerable work, "He retracted errors which he never uttered, and he retracted utterances which he knew to be truths" (p. 1). Why, is still anyone's guess; some think it was from cowardice, Mr. Green more generously lays it to shock. That he regretted his hasty recantation and was confident of his innocence is indicated by his appeal to Rome, which might well have succeeded had not Pope Calixtus III died at the critical moment. With the accession of Pius II his cause at Rome was lost; Pecock was silenced and his books were burned. But the denouement must not blind the reader to the fact that he was an effective writer, an able critic, and a good if not first-class scholar. He was a man of no mean stature, but one of whom it was said that he "wished to know more than was fitting." All this Mr. Green makes abundantly clear with adequate argument and illustration. Had he employed a little more artistry the book would have been more readable.

AUSTIN P. EVANS

L'ART RELIGIEUX DE XII<sup>e</sup> AU XVIII<sup>e</sup> SIECLE: EXTRAITS CHOISIS PAR L'AUTEUR. Par *Emile Mâle* de l'Académie Française et de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Directeur honoraire de l'Ecole Française de Rome. (Paris, Librairie Armand Colin, 1945, pp. 216, 130 fr.)

GENERAL, INSTITUTIONAL, AND POLITICAL

- JOSEPH R. STRAYER. What Is Medieval History? *Social Educ.*, Nov.  
 SAMUEL KLIGER. The "Goths" [Jutes?] in England: An Introduction to the Gothic Vogue in Eighteenth Century Aesthetic Discussion. *Mod. Philol.*, Nov.  
 D. W. ROBERTSON, JR. *Buzones*, An Alternative Etymology. *Stud. Philol.*, Oct.  
 F. T. WAINWRIGHT. The Chronology of the "Mercian Register." *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.  
 LEVI FOX. The Early History of Coventry. *History*, Mar., 1945.  
 HARRY ROTHWELL. The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297. Part III. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.  
 K. B. MCFARLANE. Henry V, Bishop Beaufort and the Red Hat, 1417-21. *Ibid.*  
 MARJORIE McC. MORGAN. Early Canterbury Jurisdiction. *Ibid.*  
 GEORGE J. METCALF. Latin and German Abstractions as Forms of Address [honorary titles in fourteenth century letters and petitions]. *Germanic Rev.*, Oct.  
 JOSEPH BABAD. The Jews in Medieval Carinthia. *Hist. Judaica*, Oct.

LEGAL

- HERMANN KANTOROWICZ. A Greek Justinian Constitution Quoted in the *Dissensiones Dominorum*. *Seminar*, III, 1945.  
 HANS JULIUS WOLFF. The Background of the Postclassical Legislation on Illegitimacy. *Ibid.*  
 ALBERT A. EHRENZWEIG. A Common Language of World Jurisprudence: Teaching Roman Law in Twenty Hours [valuable footnotes]. *Univ. Chicago Law Rev.*, Apr., 1945.  
 QUIRINUS BREEN. The Twelfth-Century Revival of the Roman Law. *Oregon Law Rev.*, June.

- CHARLES MORSE. The Conqueror's Ninth Centenary. *Canadian Bar Rev.*, Dec.  
 G. B. FLAHIFF. The Writ of Prohibition to Court Christian in the Thirteenth Century. Part II. *Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.  
 F. SCHULZ. Bracton and Raymond de Peñafort. *Law Quar. Rev.*, July.  
 JOHN C. GARDNER. An Historical Survey of the Law of Scotland prior to the Reign of David I [concl.]. *Juridical Rev.*, Aug.

## ECONOMIC

- FLORENCE EDLER DE ROOVER. Early Examples of Marine Insurance. *Jour. Ec. Hist.*, Nov.  
 FREDERIC C. LANE. Venture Accounting in Medieval Business Management. *Bull. Bus. Hist. Soc.*, Nov.

## ECCLESIASTICAL AND THEOLOGICAL

- D. H. VANDERHOVEN. S. Benoît a-t-il connu la Règle du Maître? *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XL, 1944-45.  
 R. A. L. SMITH. The Early Community of St. Andrew at Rochester, 604-c. 1080. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.  
 JOHN HENNIG. St. Albert, Patron of Cashel: A Study in the History of Diocesan Episcopacy in Ireland. *Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.  
 J. T. MUCKLE. The Doctrine of St. Gregory of Nyssa on Man as the Image of God. *Ibid.*  
 V. L. KENNEDY. Robert Courson on Penance. *Ibid.*  
 NICOLAS HUYGHEBAERT. Un legat de Gregoire VII en France. Warmond de Vienne. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XL, 1944-45.  
 HENRI GLAESENER. Les démêlés de Godefroid le Barbu avec Henri III et l'évêque Wazon. *Ibid.*  
 DOM DAVID KNOWLES. Revision to Lists of Medieval Religious Houses. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.  
 G. DONALDSON. The Scottish Episcopate at the Reformation. *Ibid.*

## MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE LEARNING

- CHARLES H. BEESON. The Collectaneum of Hadoard. *Class. Philol.*, Oct.  
 J. REGINALD O'DONNELL. The Meaning of "Silva" in the Commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato by Chalcidius. *Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.  
 CHARLES C. MIEROW. The Thirty-Five Vatican MSS of St. Jerome's *Vita Malchi*. *Speculum*, Oct.  
 LESLIE W. JONES. The Influence of Cassiodorus on Medieval Culture. *Ibid.*  
 R. WEISS. Piero del Monte, John Whethamstede, and the Library of St. Albans Abbey. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.  
 WALTER H. CARNAHAN. History of Algebra [from Egypt to the twelfth century Leonardo]. *School Sci. and Math.*, Jan.  
 LYNN THORNDIKE. Peter of Limoges and the Comet of 1299. *Isis*, Oct.  
*Id.* Franco de Polonia and the Turquet. *Ibid.*  
 HERBERT WEISINGER. English Attitudes towards the Relationship between the Renaissance and the Reformation. *Church Hist.*, Sept.  
*Id.* The Renaissance Theory of the Reaction against the Middle Ages as a Cause of the Renaissance. *Speculum*, Oct.

## LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, JR. Geographical and Ethnic Names in the *Nibelungenlied*. *Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.  
 EDWIN H. ZEYDEL. Were Hrotsvitha's Dramas Performed during Her Lifetime? *Speculum*, Oct.  
*Id.* The Authenticity of Hrotsvitha's Works. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Jan.  
 HENRY and RENEE KAHANE. Akritas and Arcita: A Byzantine Source of Boccaccio's *Teseida*. *Speculum*, Oct.  
 ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE. Arturus Cosmocrator. *Ibid.*  
 ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. On the Loathly Bride. *Ibid.*  
 ARTHUR C. L. BROWN. The Esplumoir and Viviane. *Ibid.*  
 ALFRED ADLER. Sovereignty as the Principle of Unity in Chretien's *Erec*. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Dec.

- A. J. DENOMY. *Fin' Amors: The Pure Love of the Troubadours, Its Amoralism and Possible Source. Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.
- EMIL L. FACKENHEIM. A Treatise on Love by Ibn Sina. Translated. *Ibid.*
- GEORGE R. COFFMAN. The Present State of a Critical Edition of Piers Plowman. *Speculum*, Oct.
- CURT F. BÜHLER. Notes on the Campsall Manuscript of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* now in the Pierpont Morgan Library. *Ibid.*
- B. J. WHITING. A Fifteenth-Century English Chaucerian: The Translator of *Partonope of Blois. Med. Stud.*, VII, 1945.

## ART

- DAVID M. ROBB. The Capitals of the Panteón de Los Reyes, San Isidoro de León. *Art. Bull.*, Sept.
- MILLARD MEISS. Light as Form and Symbol in Some Fifteenth-Century Paintings. *Ibid.*
- MEYER SCHAPIRO. "Muscipula Diaboli," the Symbolism of the Mérode Altarpiece. *Ibid.*

## Modern European History

## BRITISH EMPIRE

Francis H. Herrick

HANDBOOK OF DATES FOR STUDENTS OF ENGLISH HISTORY. Edited by C. R. Cheney. [Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks, No. 4.] (London, Royal Historical Society, 1945, pp. xvii, 164. 6s.) A valuable service has been rendered historians in the publication of this handbook, which is offered by the editor as an introduction to methods of chronology and as a convenient means of verifying dates in English historical records. Its value lies in its compact presentation of much information which would otherwise have to be sought in scattered works, of which some are out of date and others not readily accessible. The editor has made no attempt to put together a systematic treatise on chronology but has limited the scope of the book to situations which students will normally encounter. Of the ten sections which make up the book, three are reprinted, with revisions, from Professor Powicke's *Handbook of British Chronology* (1939): "Reckonings of Time," "Saints' Days and Festivals," and "Legal Chronology." The remaining sections include a list of English rulers and regnal years, a list of popes from Gregory I, a discussion of the Roman calendar, a chronological table of Easter days, and complete tables of possible Easter dates. Particular attention should be called to the editor's list of popes, which is an improvement on previous partial and incomplete lists, and to Professor Plucknett's sections on the law terms and the terms of the court of Arches. Although it might appear that the book is intended primarily for the medievalist, the topics covered are by no means confined to medieval chronology. Several sections, in addition to the lists and tables, are concerned with modern chronology and include short comments on the divisions of the day, a discussion of nautical reckoning used in ships' logs, and a calendar for the year 1752 when the Gregorian calendar was adopted in England. In his preface the editor warns of the many pitfalls which may beset the student and cautions against neglecting the more detailed books on chronology, as well as related works on paleography and diplomatics. As a guide to the most important of those books, the seven-page bibliography is excellent.

GEORGE L. HASKINS

THE SPIRIT OF ENGLISH HISTORY. By A. L. Rowse, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1945, pp. 158, \$2.00.) This little book is a digest of English history from earliest times to the present—the history of the

English people in 144 pages. How is it done? Not by omitting important phases of English history or significant details. Some English histories five times as large have fewer names of people and fewer references to specific events. Despite its size Mr. Rowse's story has time to tell of landscape gardening and chemistry. Brevity is achieved by boldness of interpretation—the writer's own view without reference to other views—by use of the vivid phrase; and occasionally by adroit use of colon and semicolon, so that a sentence may carry its maximum load. For whom does Mr. Rowse write? Not for the beginner, who would miss nine tenths of the allusions. In the manner of G. M. Trevelyan, Mr. Rowse writes for an audience that knows its English history and seeks to review it quickly in company with an experienced, talented guide. A reader who takes up this book with such a purpose in mind will not be disappointed. He will find a swift-moving, vivid commentary on English history, one that stays close to the views of up-to-date specialists.

F. M. MARCHAM

THE LIFE OF EDMUND SPENSER. By *Alexander C. Judson*. [The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition. Edited by Edwin Greenlaw, Charles Grosvenor Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford, Ray Heffner.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1945, pp. xii, 238, \$4.50.) Outside of what Edmund Spenser himself wrote all that is positively known about his life could probably be written in a few short paragraphs. The rest is inference, surmise, and conjecture. Out of such material Professor Judson has written a biography which runs to some 212 pages. The book adds little or nothing to our scanty knowledge of the subject. Most of it is background, or what Professor Judson calls "the atmosphere in which Spenser moved." It would not be unfair to say that quite apart from Spenser's presence, the court of Queen Elizabeth and the Munster plantation in Ireland, between which Spenser seems to have divided most of his adult life, were among the liveliest spots in the world of his time. If we don't know as much as might be known about Munster, we know a great deal about the court of Elizabeth, enough certainly to enable a skillful artist to draw a satisfactory picture of it. Even in Munster the main features of a desperately bad situation might still be set forth. But Professor Judson has done none of these things. He has given us neither a clear picture of Spenser nor a clear picture of the Elizabethan court circles nor anything approaching a clear picture of Munster. He has simply strung together all the stuff he could assemble about Spenser and enclosed it in an "atmosphere" which is foggy to say the least and which, fog-like, serves to distort the few familiar landmarks which it reveals. As a biography it is misleading because it emphasizes the wrong attributes. It is mainly concerned with showing that Spenser was a mere time-server at court and a mere land-grabber in Ireland, whereas the really important thing about the man is that he was a great poet. Our modern masters of English literature have become so preoccupied with the business of collecting and documenting data, that they appear to be rapidly losing the art of composing their findings into anything which deserves to be classified as literature. Any first-rate writer of fiction with the bare outline of what little is known about Spenser's life and with Spenser's poetry before him could have presented a more convincing and probably a more authentic portrait. Strangely enough, the one thing which the technicians in literature do well, to wit, bibliography, is in this case done rather badly. Bibliographical data should have at least the merit of precision, yet there is at least one instance in Professor Judson's bibliography in which one of an author's works is listed when another is intended, four or five in which dates of publication are wrong and innumerable instances of failure to select the best edition of a book of which many editions are available. These



minutiae do not matter too much, but if they are to be done at all they should be done carefully. The binding, the paper, and the letterpress do great credit to the Johns Hopkins Press.

CONYERS READ

ELIZABETH AND LEICESTER. By *Milton Waldman*. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1945, pp. 211, \$3.00.) Mr. Waldman is interesting and clever, he writes in a style that is pleasingly informal, and he strikes off an occasional bon mot that is most apt. But his history is of a very popular kind. The first half of his book deals with Elizabeth's love affair in the early years of her reign with Robert Dudley, later earl of Leicester, her handsome and splendid Master of the Horse. It is a good story, and Mr. Waldman makes the most of it. Of the exact nature of their relations he writes, "Elizabeth and Robert, two people who, when serious conflict threatened between desire and circumstances, made it a rule of life to seek an accommodation with both, may have carried this policy into their private relationship." But Elizabeth did not marry Leicester; and their "stormy passage from courtship to friendship" leaves Mr. Waldman in the second half of his book with something of an anticlimax. "What had been a drama petered out into a problem." Hence he can do little more than give us a sketch of Leicester's career as courtier, councilor, and soldier during the last twenty years of his life. Mr. Waldman does not pretend to have done more than write a "narrowly personal essay on Elizabeth and Leicester." But the personal history of great historical figures can be misleading. There is nothing so remarkable in the fact that Elizabeth, a young woman still in her twenties, should have fallen in love with Robert Dudley. The important point is that her political sagacity told her that the marriage was impossible and that her control of her emotions enabled her, in spite of many love tricks, to put the marriage aside. The affair with Leicester was an episode. To give it undue emphasis is to throw history out of proportion. It is to make Elizabeth less than she was and to make Leicester more. Mr. Waldman works from sources and from the best secondary materials. But his grasp of the period is superficial. Parliament was not passing "increasingly under the mighty shadow of the Crown." The English were not "the unruliest people in Europe." England did not contain "vast primeval forests." Mary Stuart was more than a "remote pretender" to Elizabeth's throne. Finally, Mr. Waldman has a trick always irritating to historians: he throws about his theme an atmosphere of mystery which, one would suppose, it was his duty to clarify and not to deepen.

DAVID HARRIS WILLSON

#### THE VOYAGE OF SIR HENRY MIDDLETON TO THE MOLUCCAS, 1604-1606.

A new and enlarged edition with an Introduction and Notes by *Sir William Foster*. [Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, Second Series, No. LXXXVIII.] (London, Hakluyt Society, distributed by Bernard Quaritch, 1943, pp. xlii, 208, £1 7s. 0d.) The narrative of Middleton's voyage to Bantam and the Moluccas was written by a member of the crew. It has an account of the Dutch capture of the Portuguese forts in the Moluccas, which took place while the English ships were there. The volume also includes the narrative by Edmund Scott of his experiences while in charge of the East India Company's trading post at Bantam from 1603 to 1605. Middleton's was only the second voyage of the English East India Company; but relations with the Dutch were already seriously strained. Scott's account shows that in an emergency the Europeans supported one another against the Javanese; but with this exception the Dutch were plainly determined to oust their weaker rivals from the spice trade. The rivalry which culminated in the massacre of Amboyna was already well established. Scott gives a vivid picture of life in seventeenth century Java. Arson and robbery seem

to have been the major occupations of a good part of the population of Bantam; bribery of officials was an essential item of business expenses; and the death rate from disease was very heavy, both afloat and ashore. The staff of the English factory at Bantam was halved by dysentery; and Middleton's own ship lost twenty-five men in twenty-one days from the same disease, amongst them significantly enough the cook and the baker. The Englishmen at Bantam were paid from £1 to £6 a month, salaries that were miserably low even when translated into their modern equivalents.

LENNOX A. MILLS

SHORT-TITLE CATALOGUE OF BOOKS PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, IRELAND, WALES, AND BRITISH AMERICA AND OF ENGLISH BOOKS PRINTED IN OTHER COUNTRIES, 1641-1700. By *Donald Wing*. (New York, Index Society, 1945, pp. 590, \$15.00, \$10.00 to members.)

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY COUNTRY GENTLEMAN: SIR FRANCIS THROCKMORTON, 1640-80. By *F. A. B. Barnard*. (Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons, 1945[?], pp. 108, 10s. 6d.) "Mr. Barnard, who has devoted many years to research in the archives of the old country houses of Britain, has discovered a ledger of the Commonwealth-Restoration period at Coughton Court, Warwickshire, the seat of the Throckmorton family, which records the day-to-day expenditures of Sir Francis Throckmorton from the age of eleven until ten months after his marriage. From these prosaic entries Mr. Barnard has produced a consecutive narrative of young Throckmorton's daily activities, amplified by footnotes drawn from an extensive antiquarian knowledge of the period and the localities involved."

BRITISH PUBLIC OPINION AND THE FIRST PARTITION OF POLAND. By *D. B. Horn*. (Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1945, pp. vii, 98, 10s. 6d.) This slender volume was written while conditions of war hindered access to needed sources and while the disputed boundaries of Poland and the claims of rival groups for its government made the subject of immediate interest in Great Britain. The author describes it as "essentially an anthology" containing "quotations from the literature . . . from 1772 to 1775." He leaves the reader to "draw his own deductions and, if he feels inclined, make comparisons with the present day [December, 1944], when yet another partition of Poland is in prospect." The book suffers from the conditions under which it was written and from the method of its organization. The titles of five chapters indicate sources of the quotations: "Government and Opposition Leaders," "Men of Letters," "Magazines," "Newspapers," "Travelers and Traders"; more interesting are the chapters devoted to "John Lind, the Polish Pamphleteer" and to the "Origins of the Nineteenth Century Liberal Attitude to Poland." Dr. Horn is too competent and well-informed a student of British foreign relations in the eighteenth century not to contribute helpful guidance on some points even while trying to refrain from doing so. It is unfortunate that circumstances made it impossible for him to gather more adequate information and that he did not correlate the ephemeral expressions of opinion more closely with the various stages of the negotiation. Political leaders in the eighteenth century were as unlikely as those of today to express opinions on such a question as the partition of Poland unconnected with other current public affairs. Items in the press were even more likely then than now to reflect the reaction of political leaders to circumstances of the moment. That Dr. Horn appreciates these facts is evident in the account of Lind, a native Briton who seems to have become a sort of semiofficial Polish propagandist.

W. T. LAPRADE

THE FIRST WAR CORRESPONDENT: WILLIAM HOWARD RUSSELL OF *THE TIMES*. By *Rupert Furneaux*. (London, Cassell, 1945[?], pp. 240, 12s. 6d.) "Russell worked for *The Times* newspaper, which had earned for itself the name of 'The Thunderer' for its outspoken criticism of the Government, during the greatest period of British journalism, covering the period from the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny to the Franco-Prussian War and the siege of Paris in 1870. His despatches from the Crimea, with their fearless revelations of the terrible living conditions in the British army at that time, overturned the Government and set in motion many army reforms. While it contains no new material, the present biography makes full use of Russell's letters and despatches and is illustrated by many sketches and photographs."

BRITISH ORDERS AND DECORATIONS. By *James Charles Risk*. [Numismatic Notes and Monographs, Number 106.] (New York, American Numismatic Society, 1945, pp. 124, plates, \$4.00.)

BRITISH MERCHANTMEN AT WAR: THE OFFICIAL STORY OF THE MERCHANT NAVY, 1939-1944. By *James Lansdale Hodson*. (New York, Ziff-Davis, 1945, pp. 142, \$1.50.)

THE CANADIANS IN BRITAIN, 1939-1944. With a Foreword by Lieutenant-General J. C. Murchie, C.B., C.B.E., Chief of the General Staff, Canada. [The Canadian Army at War, No. 1.] Published by authority of the Minister of National Defence. (Ottawa, King's Printer, 1945, pp. 172, 25 cents.)

ARCHIVES YEAR BOOK FOR SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY. Published by Authority of the Minister of the Interior. Edited by *C. Graham Botha*, Chief Archivist for the Union; *Coenraad Beyers*, Assistant Chief Archivist for the Union; *J. L. M. Franken*; *H. B. Thom*; Secretary: *D. J. Pieterse*, Archivist. FIFTH YEAR, Parts I and II. (Cape Town, Cape Times Limited for the Government Printer, 1943, pp. 238, 272.) KAAPSE PLAKKAATBOEK. Deel I (1652-1707). Afgeskryf en persklaar gemaak deur *Mej. M. K. Jeffreys*, van die personeel van die Kaapse Argief. [Kaapse Argiefstukke.] Uitgegee op las van die Minister van Binnelandse Sake, en onder Toesig van die Argiefkommissie. (Capetown, Cape Times Limited, 1944, pp. xxiv, 382.) For some time there has been evident in South Africa a most encouraging tendency to concentrate upon the stuff of social and economic history and less upon constitutional, political, and military issues. South African constitutional and political history has been passionate and violent, so that students have been excusably drawn to a study of these issues. It is a sign of the vigor and the greater objectivity of historical research and criticism in South Africa that such an effort is being made to bring into focus the intensely interesting materials of social and economic history. Miss Jeffreys has edited the first volume of the *placaats* or laws or official announcements promulgated at the Cape between 1652 and 1707. The reviewer would rather read this book of original and documentary material than another book based on the documents, but that is a pleasant professional weakness that is common enough. To those who read Dutch, this volume of laws and edicts is most unusually rewarding. Further volumes will be most welcome. *The Archives Year Book for South African History* continues to serve its very useful function as a means of publishing research work done by South African students in their own history. The present volumes are clearly the most successful in the series up to the present. The subjects are well chosen. The writing is based upon original sources. J. H. Breytenbach's thesis on "Andries Francois du Toit, His Share in Transvaal History" deals with a period in which documentary sources are scarce

and little known. He publishes a few letters which lead the reviewer to express the earnest wish to see a collection made of such letters. They are so revealing of the character and thought of those pioneers who created the South African Republic that their publication *in extenso* seems imperative. Mrs. Lewsen has taken an outstanding crisis in the history of responsible government in the British Empire. She correctly interprets the problem and handles it objectively and with an exemplary economy of language. She makes it clearer than ever that while Molteno was on the side of constitutional principle, Carnarvon was the man of greater vision and understanding.

C. W. DE KIEWIET

#### ARTICLES

- DAVID BEERS QUINN. Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory. *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, Dec.
- W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS. How Darnley Died. *Juridical Rev.*, Aug.
- W. R. CHAPLIN. William Rainsborough (1587-1642) and His Associates of the Trinity House. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
- CHARLES RICHARD CAMMELL. Buckingham: A Vindication. *New English Rev.*, Sept.
- R. C. LATHAM. English Revolutionary Thought, 1640-60. *History*, Mar., 1945.
- B. H. G. WORMALD. How Hyde Became a Royalist. *Cambridge Hist. Jour.*, VIII, 2.
- WILBUR CORTEZ ABBOTT. The Restoration Press. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- H. M. ROBERTSON. The Economic Development of the Cape under Van Riebeck. *So. African Jour. Ec.*, Mar., June, Sept.
- G. FINDLEY SHIRRAS and J. H. CRAIG. Sir Isaac Newton and the Currency. *Ec. Jour.*, June-Sept.
- NORMAN SYKES. Archbishop Wake and the Whig Party: 1716-23. A Study in Incompatibility of Temperament. *Cambridge Hist. Jour.*, VIII, 2.
- SAMUEL CLYDE McCULLOCH. Dr. Thomas Bray's Commissary Work in London, 1696-1699. *William and Mary Quar.*, Oct.
- Id.* Dr. Thomas Bray's Final Years at Aldgate, 1706-1730. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Dec.
- LOUIS TAYLOR MERRILL. The English Campaign for the Abolition of the Slave Trade. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Oct.
- HENRY REES. The Growth of Bristol. *Ec. Geog.*, Oct.
- M. S. RIX. Company Law: 1844 and To-day. *Ec. Jour.*, June-Sept.
- W. H. VERRAN. Shipbuilding at Newquay and Notes on Local Vessels. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
- H. A. INNIS. The English Press in the Nineteenth Century: An Economic Appraisal. *Univ. Toronto Quar.*, Oct.
- G. N. CLARK. The Origin of the *Cambridge Modern History*. *Cambridge Hist. Jour.*, VIII, 2.
- DAVID OWEN. "Where Now Is Britain?" *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.
- CHARLES L. MOWAT. Some Recent Books on the British Labor Movement. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.
- ROBERT LESLIE JONES. The Agricultural Development of Lower Canada, 1850-1867. *Agric. Hist.*, Oct.
- A. G. HARVEY. David Stuart: Okanagan Pathfinder and Founder of Kamloops. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- PAUL KNAFLUND. James Stephen on Granting Vancouver Island to the Hudson's Bay Company, 1846-1848. *Ibid.*
- B. A. McKELVIE. Jason Allard: Fur Trader, Prince, and Gentleman. *Ibid.*
- THOMAS R. WEIR. Early Trails of Burrard Peninsula. *Ibid.*
- T. W. BISSETT. Rt. Hon. Sir John Thompson. *Dalhousie Rev.*, Oct.
- G. W. SIMPSON. Murray and Morton: Maritimers in Western Canada. *Ibid.*
- LIONEL GELBER. Canada's New Statute. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- R. M. SMYLLIE. Unneutral Neutral Eire. *Ibid.*
- JAMES HORNELL. The Pearling Fleets of South India and Ceylon. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
- ERIC WILLIAMS. The Historical Background of British Guiana's Problems. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

- JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT. Selkirk's Return from Assiniboia via the United States to the Canadas, 1817-1818. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.  
 JULIA H. MACLEOD. The Duke of York's Plans for the Army. *Huntington Lib. Quar.*, Nov.  
 Some Crimean Letters. II. *Army Quar.*, Oct.

FRANCE AND BELGIUM

COMPTES, PROFITS, ESCLAVES ET TRAVAUX DE DEUX SUCRERIES DE SAINT-DOMINGUE (1774-1798). By G. Debien. [Notes d'histoire coloniale—VI.] (Extract from the *Revue de la Société d'Histoire et de Géographie d'Haïti*, October, 1944, and January, 1945, pp. 1-60, 1-60.) Specialists in European expansion have long clamored for a sound economic history of the French West India islands in their heyday. No such work is possible until a thorough study of the old plantation system has been made and this has been delayed by the fact that neither Parisian nor provincial archives, with their wealth of data on commodity production and commercial relations in general, contain much information on the operation of specific holdings. Since estates were private property, records bearing on their economy were normally kept in private hands and most of this priceless material has long since perished both in the colonies and at home. Broken files have, however, occasionally survived among family papers in France and rich indeed is the reward of the research student who trails them down in remote châteaux or in public depositories to which they have gravitated through the course of events. The present monograph is based upon the La Barre papers in the departmental archives in Poitiers. This noble family gained an interest in Santo Domingan lands through marriage in 1770 and continued in possession of them until the advent of Toussaint Louverture. The records still extant reveal that, by the latter part of the eighteenth century, plantations in this "jewel of empire" had become indivisible units which must be kept intact even though passing on to bickering heirs, that profits were huge in good years but that protracted lean spells materially reduced them, that planters were chronically up to their necks in debt, that dishonest managers fleeced absentee owners as a matter of course and that substantial profits over the years were possible only when the proprietors themselves took charge. A dozen such case studies of plantations in the several islands at various periods under the Old Regime would enable synthesisists to draw certain badly needed general conclusions. It is hoped that they will soon be forthcoming now that Professor Debien has shown the way.

LOWELL RAGATZ

FRANCE YESTERDAY AND TODAY: A SHORT SURVEY. By Katharine Munro. (New York, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1945, pp. 107, \$1.25.)

HISTOIRE DE BRUXELLES DE LA MAISON DE BOURGOGNE A 1830. Par Marcel Vanhamme, Professeur à l'Ecole Normale de la Ville de Bruxelles. [Collection Nationale, 6me série, no. 65.] (Brussels, Office de Publicité, 1945, pp. 86.)

ARTICLES

- PHILIP DUR. The Right of Taxation in the Political Theory of the French Religious Wars. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.  
 BEATRICE F. HYSLOP. The Theater during a Crisis: The Parisian Theater during the Reign of Terror. *Ibid.*  
 DUANE KOENIG. Telegraphs and Telegrams in Revolutionary France. *Scientific Monthly*, Dec., 1944.

- RUTH FRIEDRICH. The Austrian Marriage and the Fall of Napoleon. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.  
 ROBERT H. IRRMANN. Le Neptune François. *Indiana Quar. for Bookmen*, Oct.  
 SWANZIE AGNEW. The Vine in Bas Languedoc. *Geog. Rev.*, Jan.  
 DONALD F. BOND and JOSEPH M. CARRIÈRE. Anglo-French and Franco-American Studies: A Current Bibliography. *Romanic Rev.*, Oct.

## NORTHERN EUROPE

O. J. Falnes

## ARTICLES

- STEN LINDROTH. History of Science in Sweden. *Isis*, XXXVI, pt. 1, no. 103.  
 HERBERT TINGSTEN. Swedish Foreign Policy after the Second World War. *Am. Scand. Rev.*, Dec.  
 ARTHUR A. GOMSRUD. Rebirth of a Nation; the Extraordinary Story of Norway's Underground. *Free World*, Oct.  
 J. MORITZEN. Denmark's Frontier and Minority Problem: Question of Schleswig. *Current Hist.*, Jan.  
 A. J. FISCHER. Interim Solution in Denmark. *Contemp. Rev.*, Dec.  
 KAI BERG MADSEN and KNUD RASMUSSEN. Fighting Denmark: A Résumé. *Am. Scand. Rev.*, Dec.  
 JOHN ILMARI KOLEHMAINEN. Finnish Overseas Emigration from Arctic Norway and Russia. *Agric. Hist.*, Oct.  
 ODD NANSSEN. Grini Prisoner No. 480 [Francis Bull]. *Am. Scand. Rev.*, Mar.  
 NABOTH HEDIN. The Labor Front in Sweden. *Ibid.*  
 MOGENS HAUGSTAD and KNUD HENDRIKSEN. Return of the Lion [of Isted to Denmark]. *Ibid.*

## GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND AUSTRIA

Ernst Posner

## ARTICLES

- THOMAS MANN. Deutschland und die Deutschen. *Neue Rundschau*, Oct.  
 Id. Germany and the Germans. *Yale Rev.*, Winter.  
 HANS M. WOLFF. Justus Möser: Vernünftige Geschichte und geschichtliche Vernunft. *Mod. Philol.*, Nov.  
 ADOLF KOBER. The French Revolution and the Jews in Germany. *Jewish Soc. Stud.*, Oct.  
 ERNST CASSIRER. Thomas Manns Goethe-Bild. Eine Studie über Lotte in Weimar. *Germanic Rev.*, Oct.  
 JOHN HENNIG. Jean Paul and Ireland. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, July.  
 ADOLF KOBER. Jewish Preaching and Preachers, a Contribution to the History of the Jewish Sermon in Germany and America. *Hist. Judaica*, Oct.  
 HANS KOHN. Treitschke: National Prophet. *Rev. Politics*, Oct.  
 M. R.-C. NANSON. Heligoland. *Coast Artillery Jour.*, Nov.  
 M. L. FLANIGAN. Some Origins of German Petroleum Policy. *Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.  
 ERNST L. LOEWENBERG. Lilienthal and America. *Monatsh. f. Deutsch. Unterricht*, Oct.  
 ERICH ROSENTHAL and KURT OBERLAENDER. Books, Papers and Essays by Georg Simmel. *Am. Jour. Sociol.*, Nov.  
 HEINZ BLUHM. Ernst Cassirer und die deutsche Philologie. *Monatsh. f. Deutsch. Unterricht*, Nov.  
 RUDOLF RITTER. Lehren der Weimarer Republik. *Schweizer Monatsh.*, Apr., 1945.  
 HELMUT HIRSCH. The Saar Plebiscite of 1935. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.  
 ERNEST HAMBURGER. Coup d'oeil sur les finances de guerre de l'Allemagne. *Rev. Pol. et Parlementaire*, May.  
 SVEND RIEMER. Personality Structure and Nazi Fiction. *Soc. Forces*, Oct.  
 CARL MAYER. The Crisis of German Protestantism. *Soc. Research*, Nov.



- J. WERNER. Zur Lage der Geisteswissenschaften in Hitler-Deutschland. *Schweiz. Hochschulzeitung*, 1945-1946, no. 2.
- ERIC FISCHER. German Geographical Literature 1940-1945. *Geog. Rev.*, Jan.
- WILLIAM HARLAN HALE. Germany's Deformed Conscience. *Harper's*, Jan.
- JOHN J. McCLOY. American Occupation Policies in Germany. *Proc. Acad. Pol. Sci.*, Jan.
- WILLIAM HARLAN HALE. Our Failure in Germany. *Harper's*, Dec.
- ALBERT LAUTERBACH. The Future of German Finance. *Jour. Politics*, Nov.
- ROBERT RIE. The Habsburg Problem. *Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.
- ERIK R. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN. The Southern Boundaries of Austria. *Jour. Central Eur. Affairs*, Oct.
- FRANÇOIS HONTI. Montesquieu et la Hongrie. *Rev. Nouv. de la Hongrie*, May, 1945.
- PIERRE BALABÁN. L'évolution agraire en Hongrie. *Ibid.*
- P. IGNAZ HESS. Die Entstehung der Korporationsrechte und der Privatalpen in Unterwalder. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Gesch.*, XXV, no. 3.
- KARL FRY. Nunzius Giovanni Antonio Volpe und das Veltlin. *Ibid.*
- GOTTFRIED BOHNENBLUST. Spittlers hundertster Geburtstag. *Schweizer Monatsh.*, Apr., 1945.
- S. W. GOULD. The Slovenes: Education and Historical Development *vs.* National Consciousness Today. *Social Stud.*, Nov.

## ITALY

### *Gaudens Megaro*

#### ARTICLES

- VINCENT LUCIANI. Bibliography of Italian Studies in America [cont.]. *Italica*, Sept.
- G. BONFANTE and A. FOULET. Il nome di Pantelleria. *Ibid.*
- AUGUSTO BORSELLI. I manoscritti della Collezione Cavagna [in library of the University of Illinois] relativi alla famiglia Lampugnani di Parma. *Ibid.*
- JOHN KENNETH LESLIE. Italian Plays and Players in Montevideo (1835-1845). *Ibid.*
- JOHN J. PASCIUTTI. The Mad Triumvirate: Oriani, D'Annunzio and Mussolini Formed the Lunatic Fringe. *Sat. Rev. Lit.*, Oct. 27.
- GAETANO SALVEMINI. The Italo-Yugoslav Frontier. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- GEORGE DE SANTILLANA. Italy's Bad Dream. *Atlantic*, Oct.
- GENET. Letter from Rome. *New Yorker*, Dec. 1.
- DANIEL LANG. A Pale Young Man [Randolfo Pacciardi]. *Ibid.*, Dec. 8.
- LEO VALIANI. What Italy's Left Wants. *New Repub.*, Dec. 10.
- Id.* The Italian Crisis. *Nation*, Dec. 15.
- DONALD DOWNES. Cynicism Wins in Italy. *Ibid.*, Jan. 5.
- ALBERTO MORAVIA. Letter from Rome. *Ibid.*
- MAX ASCOLI. Politics in Italy. *Free World*, Jan.

## RUSSIA AND POLAND

### *Avrahm Yarmolinsky*

POLAND AND RUSSIA, 1919-1945. By *James T. Shotwell*, Bryce Professor, Emeritus, History of International Relations, Columbia University; Director, Division of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and *Max M. Laserson*, Visiting Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University; formerly Professor at the Riga Graduate School of Economics, and Assistant Professor of Constitutional Law, St. Petersburg University. (New York, King's Crown Press for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945, pp. vi, 114, \$2.25.) Poland and Russia have fought each other for centuries, and the fact that both countries fought Nazi Germany has been of little consequence in the latest Russo-Polish quarrel. In 1920 Poland,

having defeated Russia, obtained a frontier with the Soviet state which, in the judgment of Allied statesmen at the time and of most observers ever since, was too far to the east, ethnographically speaking. It is true that the Russian government of the time accepted the frontier easily enough and, before the war of 1920, even offered Poland a line still farther to the east. But at that moment Russian national feeling was at its lowest ebb, and Lenin believed frontiers immaterial in view of the world revolution which he still thought impending. Twenty years later, when Russian nationalism had become a strong factor in Soviet foreign policy and Poland had collapsed under German attack, it should not have surprised anyone that the Soviet Union seized the eastern provinces of Poland, where the Poles represented a minority of the population, and declared that the future Russo-Polish frontier must approximate the so-called "Curzon Line" recommended by Britain in 1919 and urged upon Poland by both Britain and France in 1920 as an armistice line for concluding the war with Russia. In spite of the insistence of the Polish government in exile that the frontier of 1920, as laid down in detail by the Treaty of Riga of 1921, must be restored, enlightened Polish opinion was aware of the danger created by that frontier. In 1925 a prominent Polish politician explained to the writer of this notice that in the event of another Russo-Polish war, the eastern provinces could be surrendered so as to avoid giving up genuine Polish land, a remarkably astute and accurate prediction. The arguments of the government in exile that (1) the frontier had received general diplomatic recognition and (2) that Poland, as the victim of German aggression, was entitled to integral restoration of its territory, while they made a certain appeal to legality and emotion respectively, remained talking points. Messrs. Shotwell and Laserson have written a short and clear history of this Polish-Russian dispute which has deeply and properly distressed the Allied world. While their tone is dispassionate and they seek a settlement of the controversy, their overtone is pro-Soviet and anti-Polish. They describe the Polish government after the death of Pilsudski as "entirely subservient to Germany" and state that Poland's minority policy "estranged the White Russians and the Ukrainians and indirectly encouraged the majority population of her eastern provinces to turn with longing toward the Soviet East." They recognize that the voting conducted by the Soviet authorities in the eastern provinces, after their seizure in September, 1939, constituted "in no way a democratic election or an impartial plebiscite," but "one has every reason to believe that even had the voting been fairly conducted the final results of the plebiscite would scarcely have favored a Polish sovereignty except in towns like Lwow and their surrounding areas where there was a clear Polish majority." They say nothing, however, about the large-scale deportations of Poles by the Soviet authorities which helped to explain the intransigence of the Polish government in exile. The authors are also critical of the "internal partition" of Poland, that is, the schism produced within the country by the unhappy events of recent years. On the other hand, they are not enamored of the projection of the Polish boundary westward into territory that has been German for centuries. At the end, they pin their hopes on the creation of a democratic regime in postwar Poland and the establishment of friendly relations between Poland and the Soviet Union, and they believe both to be possible, in spite of all the untoward circumstances they record in their little book.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT

SBORNIK MATERIALOV OTNOSYASHCHIKHSYA K ISTORII ZOLOTOI ORDY  
[collection of materials relating to the history of the Golden Horde]. Compiled by  
V. Tiesenhausen. Volume II (Moscow, Izdat. Akademii nauk, 1941, pp. 308, r. 16.60.)  
The first part of this work, containing the Arabic sources for the history of the

Golden Horde, appeared in St. Petersburg in 1884. Baron Vladimir von Tiesenhausen (1825-1902) was able to carry on his researches and publish the texts collected by him owing to the generosity of Count S. G. Stroganov, an amateur archaeologist who was the chairman of the official archaeological commission. The noted orientalist did not bring his work to completion, apparently because of his patron's death, and so the second part of his compilation has only now been brought out, after a lapse of over half a century. It is made up of excerpts from the Persian sources. As in the earlier installment, the texts are given both in the original and in Russian translation. A third volume is projected, to be devoted to the Turkish sources.

In 1942 a nonperiodical review entitled *Srednie veka* (Middle Ages) was started by the Institute of History attached to the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

A new Russian historical review, *Voprosy istorii*, has superseded the *Istoricheski zhurnal*.

## ARTICLES

- M. TIKHOMIROV. O kupecheskikh i remeslennykh ob'yedineniyakh v drevnei Rusi (XI-XV veka) [associations of merchants and artisans in ancient Russia, 11th to 15th centuries]. *Voprosy istorii*, no. 1, 1945.
- B. GREKOV. Khozyaistvennyi krizis v Moskovskom gosudarstve v 70-80 kh godakh XVI v [economic crisis in Muscovy in the 16th century]. *Ibid.*
- P. YEFIFANOV. K voprosu o voyennoi reforme Petra Velikovo [military reforms of Peter the Great]. *Ibid.*
- P. ZAIONCHKOVSKI. Voyennye reformy D. A. Milyutina [D. A. Milyutin's military reforms]. *Ibid.*, no. 2.
- WALTHER KIRCHNER. Background of German "Junker" Society in Russia: Its Development and Social Character in Pre-Russian Times. *Delaware Notes*, 18th ser., 1945.
- JULIA SAZONOVA. The German in Russian Literature. *Am. Slavic Rev.*, IV, nos. 8-9.
- CLARENCE A. HERBST. The Assassination of Alexander II. *Hist. Bull.*, Jan.
- HANS KOHN. Dostoevsky's Nationalism. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, Oct.
- ALEXANDER KERENSKY. Russia on the Eve of World War I. *Russian Rev.* Autumn.
- ALFRED BILMANIS. The Struggle for Domination of the Baltic: An Historical Aspect of the Baltic Problem. *Jour. Central Eur. Affairs*, July.
- CHARLES PRINCE. A Psychological Study of Stalin. *Jour. Soc. Psych.*, Nov.
- DAVID HECHT. Chernyshevsky and American Influence on Russia. *Sci. and Soc.*, Fall.
- MANFRED KRIDL. Poland and Russia in the Past and in the Future. *Jour. Central Eur. Affairs*, July.

## Far Eastern History

E. H. Pritchard

THE RISE AND FALL OF JAPAN. By Sir Frederick Whyte. (London, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1945, pp. 59, 1s.)

## ARTICLES

- HANSON W. BALDWIN. America at War: Victory in the Pacific. *For. Affairs*, Oct.
- MAURICE J. GOLDBLOOM. The Colonial Era Ends. *Asia*, May.
- Pattern of Reconquest. *Amerasia*, Oct.
- Reconquest versus Liberation in Asia. *Ibid.*, Nov.
- FRITZ STERNBERG. America's Economy and Asia's Tempo. *Asia*, Aug.
- BOLESAW SZCZESNIAK. The Penetration of the Copernican Theory into China and Japan (XVII-XIX Centuries). *Bull. Polish Inst. Arts and Sci. in Am.*, Apr.-July, 1945.
- LAURA THOMPSON. How To Rule Our Islands? *Asia*, Apr.

- JOHN USEEM. The Changing Structure of a Micronesian Society. *Am. Anthropologist*, Oct.-Dec.
- MASON WADE. Canada and the Pacific War. *Asia*, May.
- KURT H. WEIL. Future of Air Transportation in Asia. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- Historical Variations of China's Frontiers. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- CHI-YUN CHANG. Taiwan, China's Lost Province. *Asia*, Sept.
- TAO-SHING CHANG. The Food Situation in China. *Asiatic Rev.*, Apr.
- Y. L. CHANG. How Chinese and Western Civilizations Differ. *Asia*, July.
- CHIANG KAI-SHEK. President Chiang's V-J Day Message to the Nation [and address on foreign policy on Aug. 24, 1945]. *China at War*, Sept.-Oct.
- Chiang Kai-shek's Economic Credo: A Zaibatsu China. Full Text of "Chinese Economic Theory" by Chiang Kai-shek. *Amerasia*, Jan.
- MON-LIN CHIANG. The Democracy of China. *Asia*, July.
- YUNG-YING HSU. The Government of Yen-an: A Study of a Chinese Communist Area. *Sci. and Soc.*, Fall.
- KENNETH K. S. CH'EN. Buddhist-Taoist Mixtures in the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, Sept.
- SSU-HSIEH CHIA. The Preparation of Ferments and Wines. Translated by Huang Tzu-ch'ing and Chao Yün-ts'ung with an Introduction by Tenney L. Davis. *Ibid.*
- YI-LIANG CHOU. Notes on Marvazi's Account on China. *Ibid.*
- HENRY J. COWELL. Timothy Richard, Missionary and Mandarin: A Centenary Tribute. *Asiatic Rev.*, Oct.
- The Outlook for Democracy in China. *Amerasia*, Sept.
- Y. C. HOE. Confucius the Good Neighbor. *Asia*, May.
- ELIOT JANEWAY. Faith in China's People. *Ibid.*
- Id.* Canada's Role in China. *Ibid.*, July.
- NOEL SLATER. The Need for Continued Aid to China. *Asiatic Rev.*, Oct.
- GUNTHER STEIN. The Other China [the communist area]. *For. Affairs*, Oct.
- Id.* People's Meetings at Yen-an. *Asia*, July.
- From Stilwell to Marshall [American policy in China]. *Amerasia*, Dec.
- STEPHEN D. STURTON. The Site of the Nestorian Monastery at Hangchow. *Asiatic Rev.*, Jan., 1945.
- PEI-YING TAN. How They Worked on the Burma Road. *Asia*, Sept.
- BERNWARD H. WILLEKE. The Chinese Bible Manuscript in the British Museum. *Cath. Bibl. Quar.*, Oct.
- CHIH-CHIU YANG and YUNG-CHI HO. Marco Polo Quits China [in 1290 or 1291]. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, Sept.
- YANG KANG. China's War-Time Literature. *Asia*, July.
- Sir Charles Bell and Tibet. *Asiatic Rev.*, July.
- ANDREW J. GRAJDANZEV. Manchuria: An Industrial Survey. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- Korea—the Crossroads of Asia. *Amerasia*, Oct.
- FEDOR S. MANSVETOV. Strategic Mongolia. *Asia*, Apr.
- Id.* Inside Outer Mongolia. *Ibid.*, May.
- Id.* Russia and China in Outer Mongolia. *For. Affairs*, Oct.
- Text of Chinese-Soviet Treaty and Supplementary Agreements, Aug. 14, 1945. *China at War*, Sept.-Oct.
- OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD. We Must Free Korea Now. *Asia*, Nov.
- T. A. BISSON. The Zaibatsu's Wartime Role. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- S. R. CHOW. The Future of Japan: What Happens When Defeat Is Accomplished. *Asiatic Rev.*, July.
- LIN HU. How To Deal with Japan. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- The Surrender Instrument: Jap Emperor's Proclamation; Supreme Allied Commander's Remarks; Japanese General Order No. 1; Nanking Surrender Document; Chiang's First Order: Ho's Memorandum to Okamura. *China at War*, Sept.-Oct.
- WILLIAM C. JOHNSTONE. Future of the Japanese Mandated Islands. *For. Policy Rep.*, Sept. 15.
- T. R. G. LYELL. Japan: A Problem in Reconstruction. *Asiatic Rev.*, Oct.

- TSUYOSHI MATSUMOTO. We Fight the Emperor. *Asia*, Sept.
- JOHN T. PRATT and TYLER DENNETT. Correspondence [regarding the Taft-Katsura Agreement, July 29, 1905]. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- WILLARD PRICE. Shall Japan Be Allowed Freedom of Religion? *Asia*, Sept.
- H. G. QUARITCH WALES. Shinto's Place in World Culture. *Ibid.*, Apr.
- ROBERT S. WARD. Can Japan Win by Losing? *Ibid.*, May.
- Winning the Peace in Japan. *Amerasia*, Sept.
- J. RUSSELL ANDRUS. Burma—an Experiment in Self-Government. *For. Policy Rep.*, Dec. 15.
- KUMUT CHANDRUANG and C. PRABHA. Our Siamese Underground. *Asia*, Nov.
- CHARLES GARDNER. The Burma Campaign. *Asiatic Rev.*, July.
- E. W. HUTCHINSON. Siam—Buffer State or Federal Unit? *Ibid.*, Oct.
- MAXIMO M. KALAW. Filipino Opposition to the Japanese. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- TENGKU MAHMUD. The Attitude of Malays to the War, 1941-2. *Asiatic Rev.*, Oct.
- The Netherlands East Indies after Three Years of War. *Ibid.*
- J. R. PERCIVAL. The Problem of Malaya. *Ibid.*, Apr.
- WERNER F. SCHNEEBERGER. The Kerayan-Kalabit Highland of Central Northeast Borneo. *Geog. Rev.*, Oct.
- ROBERT SHAFER. Prefixes in Tibeto-Burmic. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, Sept.
- O. H. K. SPATE. The Burmese Village. *Geog. Rev.*, Oct.
- SIR FRANK SWEETENHAM. The Recovery of Singapore. *Asiatic Rev.*, Oct.
- M. VALLAT. The Resistance in Indochina. *Ibid.*, July.
- OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD. To Restore the Philippines. *Asia*, Oct.
- BARBARA WHITTINGHAM-JONES. The Works of Maurice Collis. *Asiatic Rev.*, July.

## United States History

E. C. Burnett

### GENERAL

EL RIO DEL ESPÍRITU SANTO: AN ESSAY ON THE CARTOGRAPHY OF THE GULF COAST AND THE ADJACENT TERRITORY DURING THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES. By *Jean Delanglez*. [United States Catholic Historical Society Monograph Series, Volume XXI.] (New York, United States Catholic Historical Society, 1945, pp. xiii, 182.) The question at issue in this essay is whether the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers is the Mississippi River. In the past it has always been assumed that this was so, and only a few writers have questioned it. In preparing this monograph, Father Delanglez has studied hundreds of maps, and from these hundreds he has selected those which are significant in the cartographical evolution of the Gulf Coast region. These maps have been grouped according to type: (1) the early maps based on the Spanish *Padrón*, showing only the coast line with an indication of the mouths of the rivers; (2) maps showing the courses of rivers delineated in accordance with the map maker's fancy and not based on exploration; (3) maps representing the interior in greater detail, but in which "it is quite difficult to separate fancy from fact, or to ascertain the source of the draughtsman's information"; (4) a completely revised type of map by De Laet. In the careful study of these maps, the author has used various means of comparison to prove his point. He has depended not only on the geographical features delineated but on nomenclature and documentary evidence. Thus explorers' accounts—that of Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca and the narratives of the De Soto expedition—have been thoroughly analyzed. For the later period French and Spanish documents concerning

exploration have been extensively examined. It is shown how the narrative of Cabeza de Vaca does not identify the name Rio del Espíritu Santo with the Mississippi; the members of the De Soto expedition did not call the great river Rio del Espíritu Santo; the writings of La Salle show he never identified the great river as the Rio del Espíritu Santo, for he had not heard this name given to the river discovered by De Soto. The conclusion reached is that "the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers is *not* the Mississippi." But the author admits that with the documentation now available it is impossible to determine with certainty the identity of this famous river or of the bay into which it empties. The reader is left with the idea, however, that if the Bahía del Espíritu Santo can be positively identified as Galveston Bay, then the Rio del Espíritu Santo would be the Trinity River. The footnotes, alone, of this volume are a valuable contribution to historical cartography. When maps are cited, for instance, it is stated where they may be found in the original and in facsimile. Notations of documents are carefully made. The bibliography is extensive, though maps which are obviously copied from others are omitted even though they have been studied. At the end of the book eight reproductions of maps show the various types. This is a work which should be examined seriously by any student of fifteenth and sixteenth century American history.

BARBARA BOSTON

JONATHAN DICKINSON'S JOURNAL, OR GOD'S PROTECTING PROVIDENCE: BEING THE NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY FROM PORT ROYAL IN JAMAICA TO PHILADELPHIA BETWEEN AUGUST 23, 1696, AND APRIL 1, 1697. Edited by *Evangeline Walker Andrews* and *Charles McLean Andrews*, Farnam Professor of American History in Yale University, Emeritus. [Yale Historical Publications, Manuscripts and Edited Texts, Volume XIX.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945, pp. x, 252, \$3.00.) Scholars will greet with pleasure this new edition of Dickinson's *Journal*, one of the outstanding seventeenth century narratives of Indian captivities. Replete with dramatic incident, this tale of shipwreck and misery on the coast of Florida and of final deliverance from the Indians by the compassion of the Spanish governor at St. Augustine, gives a vivid picture of the perils encountered by the hapless travelers. For successive generations the narrative held an especial interest as an account of the sufferings and death of the aged Robert Barrow, one of the first Quaker missionaries to the English colonies in America. Written by Barrow's fellow passenger, Jonathan Dickinson, a Quaker merchant, the first edition of the tract was published in Philadelphia in 1699, two years after Barrow's death. Between that date and 1868, fourteen reprints in English and various translations in Dutch and in German bore adequate witness to the *Journal's* continuing popularity. The present publication rescues the *Journal* from the inaccessibility of rare book collections. Such is the intrinsic interest of the tale that it may be queried whether it is not gilding the lily to furnish more than the briefest of editorial notes. But one cannot caviat at the devotion which the late Professor Andrews and Mrs. Andrews gave to the preparation of this volume, coupling fine scholarship with a loving and intimate interest in the Florida scene. The sketches of the lives of the leading figures in the *Journal* are done with painstaking care and skill. The discussion of the Florida Indians and the detailed maps of the course followed by the Quaker captives further enrich the reader's appreciation of the text. The bibliophile will value the critical commentary on earlier editions and the study of the Quaker printers, both in England and in the colonies. The reproductions of all the earlier title pages add much to the charm of the volume. The reviewer cannot close without pointing out how peculiarly fitting it seems that this last volume from Professor Andrews' hands should be one that is indicative of the links between



the British continental colonies and the British West Indies, an aspect of our history of which he was a leading exponent.

DOROTHY BURNE GOEBEL

THE JOURNALS OF HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG. Translated by *Theodore G. Tappert* and *John W. Doberstein*. Volume II. (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1945, pp. 772, \$3.50.) What is said about Muhlenberg's diary and its editorial treatment in this edition in the review of the first volume (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLIX [1943], 155) applies with equal force to the second volume, which covers the years 1764-1776. Until almost the close of this period Muhlenberg lived in Philadelphia but made numerous trips to Lutheran congregations in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and elsewhere, including one protracted journey to Georgia. Perhaps the most interesting portion of this volume for the general reader is the day by day account of the onset of the Revolution and the struggle in Muhlenberg's devout, peace-loving, realistic mind to determine where his duty lay. The entire diary abounds in concrete details of everyday life in eighteenth century America. There are, it must be conceded, pages that will appeal only to students of church history in its minutest branches, but the record as a whole is of great interest. A full index is promised in the concluding volume; this reviewer would encourage the editors and their assistants to spare no pains in making it a complete and exact register of the contents of the work, which amply deserves that kind of index. Maps would be a praiseworthy addition, for the end papers, however decorative, are hardly adequate to the purpose. Finally, a word of appreciation should be said for the Muhlenberg Press, which has published the diary at a price that can hardly cover the costs of production.

GEORGE H. GENZMER

YANKEE STONECUTTERS: THE FIRST AMERICAN SCHOOL OF SCULPTURE, 1800-1850. By *Albert TenEyck Gardner*. (New York, Columbia University Press for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1945, pp. 84, plates, \$4.00.) This is a study of the generation of the "classico-Jacksonian school" of Horatio Greenough, Thomas Crawford, Hiram Powers, and William Wetmore Story. The author wisely abstains from attempting "to renew the desiccated crowns of laurel so relentlessly pressed upon the sculptors' untroubled brows by their impetuous and well-meaning contemporaries." He says truly that "the principal importance of these sculptors lives and works today would seem to be their great value as social, cultural, and historical documents." An astonishing period of patronage it was, when Powers could turn out portrait busts—he made over a hundred—at \$1,000 apiece, sell fifty copies of his bust of Proserpina for \$400 each, realize ten times that sum for replicas of his "Greek Slave," and receive \$19,000 for his commonplace "Webster." The art lovers were conditioned to react in a certain way to a compound of white marble, and classical mythology, just as Dr. Pavlov's dogs that drooled at the sound of a bell. All this had little to do with art. Very few persons saw through it at the time. Hawthorne, whose *Marble Faun* of 1860 contributed to the later success of the movement, was far from being wholly taken in; James Jackson Jarves, the most acute American art critic of the time, was not taken in at all. Greenough, no great sculptor but an intelligent man, arrived before his death at forty-seven, in 1853, at a valid aesthetic. Of all the sculptors only William Rimmer produced work of any creative merit; his life was a tragedy of poverty and friendless neglect. The author has made an extremely comprehensive study of contemporary writings regarding all these men, he successfully relates their work and its public appreciation to the political, social, and cultural background of the time. The book, of which the original purpose was to provide a catalogue of the collection of early nineteenth century sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, lists and illustrates the

works there, provides also a biographical dictionary and extensive bibliography, including many recondite references. The form adopted for the body of the text, a series of essays on the relation of the school to aspects of American life, involves some repetition. One may remark also on a lack of any suggestion of internal evolution within a movement which, it is only fair to say, had very little of this.

FISKE KIMBALL

DAN SICKLES, HERO OF GETTYSBURG AND "YANKEE KING OF SPAIN."

By *Edgcomb Pinchon*. (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, Doran, 1945, pp. xiii, 280, \$3.50.) There are few heroes of the Dumas variety in American biography, but Dan Sickles was indeed one. His ninety-four years, ending in 1914, were filled with dashing escapades, tortuous political intrigues, exciting military adventures, and a lecherous private life, which included a Parisian love affair with Queen Isabella of Spain screened behind a marriage of convenience with her lady in waiting. As James Buchanan's legation secretary in London, Sickles showed an expansionist fervor for Cuba which sharpened the tone of the Ostend Manifesto. Returning to aid Buchanan's election to the White House, he was elected to Congress. Although his own life was filled with a succession of illicit loves and illegitimate children, he invited national notoriety by shooting Philip B. Key, son of the famous author of the "Star Spangled Banner," for an extramarital affair with Teresa, Sickles' own beautiful wife. The successful defense attorney, Edwin M. Stanton, correctly appraised public sentiment by pleading, "And may the Lord who watches over the home and family guide the bullet and direct the stroke!" During the Civil War, Sickles helped establish the principle of federal volunteers, with Lincoln's aid, against the jealous resistance of state governors. As "hero of Gettysburg," he may have—so the author believes—saved Meade from destruction by wearing down Longstreet's surprise attack. The war cost him his leg but left his spirit undaunted. As Reconstruction general in South Carolina, he was sympathetic to both races, sided with Grant politically, and proved a thorn in Johnson's side. Finally as Grant's minister to Spain, he busied himself in helping Isabella's son to the Spanish throne, intrigued for Cuba, as in Ostend Manifesto days, but resigned in disgust at Hamilton Fish's moderate policies. The book, wholly undocumented save for a hopelessly inadequate bibliography (which includes two high-school textbooks), is intended for the general reader but has the merit of adding considerable fresh material from Sickles' unpublished diaries. Few important historical problems are actually developed save by suggestion, and many of the background interpretations are dubious. Buchanan, for example, won the election of 1856 "largely by Sickles' efforts" (p. 66)—but not the slightest evidence is offered. The "human interest" angle is predominant, and that is fascinatingly done. Mr. Pinchon, evidently, was not writing for the American Historical Association.

HARVEY WISH

LAKE ERIE. By *Harlan Hatcher*. [The American Lakes Series.] (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1945, pp. 416, \$3.50.) The title of *Lake Erie* gives but a meager idea of the scope of the book, which is a history of the Lake Erie region from the earliest times. The part played by the lake in a great transportation system and the place of iron ore and steel in the industrial development of the shorelands from Buffalo to Detroit constitute the main themes. The romance of lake shipping runs strongly through the whole. In his chapters on the mid-century cities and one on spheres of influence along the south shore the author gives brief histories of Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, and smaller settlements. The Canadian shore, backward at all times, has a place. Notable, too, are the author's accounts of "Underground to Ontario," when slaves were on the run to Canada and freedom; of the "Western Islands," the "Wedding of

Coal and Iron," the "Cleveland Iron Men," the tremendous significance of the great Sault canals; and the never to be forgotten experience of one "Aboard the Ore Fleet." Really thrilling are the author's disaster stories in "Storms and Hazards." But each after his own taste. Others would choose other sections of the book for comment. It is a well-written book on an interesting subject. A few blemishes, mistakes in details, in no sense destroy the value of the book as a trustworthy record of a great section in American history. There is a tendency to drag in comparisons which will soon lose their point, if they have not already—the comparison of Anthony Wayne's advance against the Indians and General MacArthur's return from Australia to the Philippines. Local historians will take exception to some statements. For Cleveland the first wedding was in 1797 (not 1802). The author needs to revise his story of the Battle of the Bridges. Oglebay-Norton Company is no longer a subsidiary of the Cleveland Cliffs Corporation, if it was when the author did his research. In the treatment of Cleveland's history the best section is that dealing with the struggling pioneer years, a dramatic episode that appeals to the author. For some reason hard for a Clevelander to understand, in the final chapter "Along the South Shore," the section on cultural institutions gives Buffalo thirty-four lines, Detroit twenty-three and Cleveland but sixteen. Does the dean of arts and sciences at Columbus ever visit other than the big offices downtown when he comes to the state's metropolitan city? He will also doubtless hear from the local historians of Buffalo and Detroit on some details. But Clevelanders will forgive him much, for he has written a very good history of the Lake Erie region, of which they are passionately fond, if we can judge by what the newspapers say this sesquicentennial year of the city on the Cuyahoga River.

ELBERT J. BENTON

AL SMITH, AMERICAN: AN INFORMAL BIOGRAPHY. By *Frank Graham*. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1945, pp. ix, 242, \$2.50.) This popular biography surveys the life of Al Smith from the days when he played on the streets with sons and grandsons of Irish immigrants on the island of Manhattan, attended parochial school, served as altar boy, waged a winning fight against poverty, mingled with the masses, learned the rudiments of politics in a rough-and-tumble school, and served in the New York legislature, down to the years when he rose to eminence in the governorship of New York, won the Democratic nomination for the presidency of the United States, and "took a walk" after his party became the instrument of the New Deal. As a chatty, gossipy story of a colorful figure the volume is not without interest, even to the professional historian; but it adds nothing of importance to what has already been published. One wonders from what sources the author extracted pages of conversation that run through the chapters from first to last. Manuscripts and other essential biographical material have been all but ignored, with the result that the campaigns in which Mr. Smith played major roles are superficially treated. The readers for whom the biography was written would probably not relish critical appraisals of issues and men, and the author has been careful not to give offense. The professional historian might perhaps make use of the volume as a more or less unconscious revelation of the forces and interests that molded the character and shaped the career of the "Happy Warrior."

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON

A MAN FROM KANSAS: THE STORY OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE. By *David Hinshaw*. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1945, pp. xi, 305, \$3.00.) This is another of those books written by friends of William Allen White contributing to the building of a White legend. White's gift of cultivating the right friends always paid large dividends. The author supplements personal recollections mostly with White's edi-

torials in the *Emporia Gazette*, 1895-1943, the exploitation of these being the feature that most distinguishes this book from others. There was nothing at which White was more adept than dramatizing and glamorizing himself, and the Hinshaw method of selection and piecing together of White's stories, with a little editorial fabric, gives White a rather full play in his own behalf. To those historians who are interested in the history of how social myths are created, this book is a prime document.

JAMES C. MALIN

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS IN PRISON, 1940-1945. By *Mulford Sibley* and *Ada Wardlaw*. [Pacifism and Government Series V, Number 2.] (Philadelphia, Pacifist Research Bureau, 1945, pp. 68, 25 cents.)

BLAIR HOUSE PAST AND PRESENT: AN ACCOUNT OF ITS LIFE AND TIMES IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON. (Washington, Department of State, 1946, pp. 38, plates, \$1.00.)

A REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP. [United States Government Historical Reports on War Administration, Office of Censorship—Series 1.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. 54.) The report is a brief summary of a longer history, which will not be released to the public. This history will be deposited, however, in the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and the Budget Bureau files and will be available to people in government agencies who have a reason for referring to it.

THE NEWSPAPER: ITS MAKING AND ITS MEANING. By Members of the Staff of the *New York Times*. With an Introduction by John E. Wade, Superintendent of Schools, New York City. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945, pp. viii, 207, \$2.00.) In the spring of 1944 Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, who holds simultaneously the offices of chairman of the board, president, and publisher of the *New York Times*, and eleven members of his staff—all from the editorial side—gave a series of lectures on the making of their favorite newspaper. Their remarks appear in this little book. Most of what they had to say to their audience of New York City school teachers concerned the routine, but to laymen somehow romantic, procedures of gathering, writing, editing, and commenting upon the news, and the mechanical processes of newspaper manufacturing. The importance of the newspaper as a reflection of daily life, and the responsibilities of reporter, editor, and publisher in making it a reliable record for the use of future historians got thoughtful attention from the minority of speakers. Mr. Sulzberger's contribution did not make the grade. The *New York Times* is easily foremost among American newspapers as a source of factual and documentary material for the writing of current history. In years to come it presumably hopes to enjoy the same respect from new generations of historians. Certainly it will if the two threads running through this book can do it: the strong sense of loyalty of every speaker to his paper and the apparent confidence of each one that the *New York Times* is, if not perfect, at least an unexcelled approximation thereof. If this were a review of the newspaper itself, one might properly inquire whether such admiration is deserved. But what the hired hands think of their handiwork is one thing, and what they think does and should go into its making is quite another. I found the most thoughtful contributions to be those of Sunday Editor Lester Markel, Reporter James B. Reston, and Critic Brooks Atkinson. Assistant Night Managing Editor MacNeil masterfully pictured the problems of tailoring the *Times's* daily intake of a million words to fit the newsprint-rationed space for some 125,000. The

immediate and ultimate consequences of this high-pressure process—in the form of arbitrary cutting or dropping of material, snap judgments as to how and where stories are to be “played,” hastily written headlines, and so on—interested him as little as they did most of his fellows.

THOMAS K. FORD

CALABASHES AND KINGS: AN INTRODUCTION TO HAWAII. By *Stanley D. Porteus*. (Palo Alto, Pacific Books, 1945, pp. xvi, 245, \$3.50.)

A GUIDE TO COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES, AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES. Compiled under the direction of *Carter V. Good*, Professor of Education, University of Cincinnati. (Washington, American Council on Education, 1945, pp. xv, 681, \$5.00.) Those who have used the predecessors of this volume to find out about colleges and universities will discover that this issue is made up to serve advisers of returning soldiers. It is wholly in a tabular form. If it helps the returning soldier or his advisers, well and good. It is to be hoped the American Council on Education will soon find it within its resources to publish a volume with the information about institutions which preceding volumes have contained.

DIRECTORY OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION, 1945. Edited by *Franklin L. Burdette*, Executive Secretary, National Foundation for Education; Associate Professor of History and Political Science, Butler University. (Evanston, American Political Science Association, Northwestern University, 1945, pp. xiii, 235, cloth \$3.00, paper \$2.00 to nonmembers.) This “Who’s Who” of the members of the American Political Science Association is a careful compilation giving all necessary biographical information and the interests and publications of each member. This is supplemented by two useful classifications of the names according to fields of primary interest and by geographical location. It is a volume of use and interest to many outside the membership of the Political Science Association and a model of its kind.

#### ARTICLES

PHILIP C. JESSUP and GENEVIEVE PETERSON. The Equality of States as Dogma and Reality. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Dec.

EMMA WILBER HODGE. A Century of Service to Public Education. *New York Hist.*, Oct.

HOMER CLEVINGER. The Teaching Techniques of the Farmers’ Alliance: An Experiment in Adult Education. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.

CHARLES S. SYDNOR. The Southern Experiment in Writing Social History. *Ibid.*

JAMES BRYANT CONANT. Public Education and the Structure of American Society. *Teachers College Rec.*, Dec.

RALPH B. GUINNESS. Revised Historical Viewpoints. *Social Stud.*, Oct.–Jan.

MARY E. CUNNINGHAM. Round Table on the Junior Historians’ Program. *New York Hist.*, Oct.

JAMES T. BABB. The Yale University Library: Its Early American Collections. *William and Mary Quar.*, Oct.

RICHARD G. WOOD. An Archivist Looks at the Library of Congress. *Am. Archivist*, Oct.

D. E. WORCESTER. Spanish Horses among the Plains Tribes. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

THEODORE F. JONES. Roster of the Expedition of 1690 to Canada. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, Oct.

ALLEN FRENCH. The Arms and Military Training of Our Colonizing Ancestors. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941–44), 1945.

CLAIBORNE PELL. Rivalry of Colonial Forces. *Dalhousie Rev.*, Oct.

LOUIS TAYLOR MERRILL. The Puritan Policeman. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, Dec.

KATHARINE L. BIEHL. The Indentured Servant in Colonial America. *Social Stud.*, Nov.

JULIUS W. PRATT. Aaron Burr and the Historians. *New York Hist.*, Oct.

- BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG. The Correspondence of John Adams and Horatio Gates. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS. John Quincy Adams and George Washington. *Ibid.*
- HAROLD W. BRADLEY. The Political Thinking of George Washington. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- JAMES DUNCAN PHILLIPS. Jefferson's "Wicked Tyrannical Embargo." *New Eng. Quar.*, Dec.
- PHILIP MARSH. "The Vindication of Mr. Jefferson." *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.
- JOHN A. SCHULTZ. Thomas Pownall and His Negro Commonwealth. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Oct.
- J. A. BAINÉE. The Catholic Church in the United States, 1784-1828. *Recs. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Sept., Dec.
- RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON. The Origin of the Land Speculator as a Frontier Type. *Agric. Hist.*, Oct.
- DONALD MCKAY FROST. Notes on General Ashley, the Overland Trail, and South Pass. *Proc. Am. Antiquarian Soc.*, Oct., 1944.
- ARDA WALKER. The Religious Views of Andrew Jackson. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publ.*, no. 17, 1945.
- ABRAHAM H. VENIT. Isaac Bronson: His Banking Theory and the Financial Controversies of the Jacksonian Period. *Jour. Ec. Hist.*, Nov.
- GEORGE IVAN BIDEWELL. Mark Twain's Florida [Missouri] Years. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER. Learning How to Behave: A Study of American Etiquette Books. *Bull. Boston Pub. Lib.*, Jan., Feb.
- DONALD DAY. The Political Satires of George W. Harris [1814-69]. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- GEORGE D. HARMON. Divine Right and the Defense of the Union, 1860-1865. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.
- HAMBLETON TAPP. The Assassination of General William Nelson, September 29, 1862, and Its Ramifications. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- F. LAURISTON BULLARD. President Lincoln and General Meade after Gettysburg, Part II. *Lincoln Herald*, Oct.
- ALLAN NEVINS. The United States Sanitary Commission and Secretary Stanton. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- ROSCOE POUND. Bureaus and Bureau Methods in the Civil War Era. *Ibid.*
- JAMES W. SILVER. Propaganda in the Confederacy. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- F. W. GIBSON. The Alaska Boundary Dispute. *Can. Hist. Assoc. Rep.*, 1945.
- STEWART MITCHELL. The Man Who Murdered Garfield. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- SELIG ADLER. Senator Edmunds' Part in the Tenure of Office Battle, 1886. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON. Commentaries upon the Ancestry of Benjamin Harrison, IV: The Reverend Thomas Harrison, Berkeley's "Chaplain." *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- CHARLES W. KENN. The Army and Navy of Kamehameha I. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Nov.
- CLIFFORD M. DRURY. Early American Contacts with the Japanese. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Oct.
- RANDOLPH C. DOWNES. A Crusade for Indian Reform, 1922-1934. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- G. E. GOVAN and J. W. LIVINGOOD. Adolph S. Ochs: The Boy Publisher. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publ.*, no. 17, 1945.
- LEWIS B. HERSHEY. Procurement of Manpower in American Wars. *Am. Acad. Polit. and Soc. Sci.*, Sept.
- ROBERT A. GRAHAM. Universal Military Training in Modern History. *Ibid.*
- ROBERT G. ALBION. The Administration of the Navy, 1798-1945. *Public Admin. Rev.*, Autumn.
- PETER MARSH STANFORD. The People's Navy: Prospects of an American Sea Power. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Nov.
- WILLIAM H. HESSLER. The Carrier Task Force in World War II. *Ibid.*
- SARA I. CORBIN ROBERT. The Naval Academy as Housekeeper: Feeding and Clothing the Midshipmen. *Ibid.*
- ORRIN E. KLAPP. Matthew Fontaine Maury, Naval Scientist. *Ibid.*
- PAUL M. O'LEARY. Wartime Rationing and Governmental Organization. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Dec.



- GIFFORD PINCHOT. The Long Struggle for Effective Federal Water Power Legislation. *George Washington Law Rev.*, Dec.
- WILLIAM A. RUSS, JR. Godkin Looks at Western Agrarianism: A Case Study. *Agric. Hist.*, Oct.
- ARTHUR G. PETERSON. The Agricultural History Society's First Quarter Century. *Ibid.*
- GUY A. LEE. The General Records of the United States Department of Agriculture in the National Archives. *Ibid.*
- DAN STANISLAWSKI. The Origin and Spread of the Grid-Pattern Town. *Geog. Rev.*, Jan.
- DWIGHT P. FLANDERS. Geopolitics and American Post-war Policy. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Dec.

## DOCUMENTS

- JULES A. BAINÉE and JOHN J. MENG. Philadelphia and the Revolution: French Diplomacy in the United States, 1778-1779 [correspondence between Vergennes and Gérard]. *Recs. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Dec.
- EDWARD A. MALLON. Oration by Antony Laussat on Charles Carroll [Dec. 24, 1832]. *Ibid.*, June.
- JAMES ARTHUR MULLER. Two Letters from Bishop Kemper [May 28, June 23, 1838]. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Dec.
- CHESTER MCA. DESTLER. Shall Red and Black Unite? An American Revolutionary Document of 1883. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- MARTIN F. SCHMITT. An Interview with General Jubal A. Early in 1889. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- WENDELL H. STEPHENSON. The Influence of Woodrow Wilson on Frederick Jackson Turner [letter of Turner to William E. Dodd, Oct. 7, 1919]. *Agric. Hist.*, Oct.

## NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

## THE ROLE OF TRANSPORTATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF VERMONT.

By William J. Wilgus. (Montpelier, Vermont Historical Society, 1945, pp. 104, maps, \$3.00.) It is not often that one has the pleasure of reviewing a book so good that it can be given only the highest commendation. But such is the case in my opinion about *The Role of Transportation in the Development of Vermont*. The book is well written, and its author is obviously a careful student of general local history as well as of transportation. The first few chapters are devoted to the history of Vermont, its physical characteristics and resources. Such a wealth of information is condensed into these pages that if one had no other source material relative to the state, a good understanding of Vermont's history and growth could be obtained from Mr. Wilgus' thoughtful and excellent narration. The remainder of the book is entirely given over to the subject of transportation and its direct relation to the history and development of the state. Beginning with trails of marked trees leading from one settlement to another through the wilderness, then taking up in the order of their establishment, roads, waterways, turnpikes, railroads, and finally, airways, the author shows how great a factor each of them has been in the development of the state's institutions, its population, and its wealth. It must be remembered that the book is not a history of transportation; it is, rather, a studied, short sketch of the influence of transportation upon state development. However, Mr. Wilgus has also given a brief history of the common carriers as they came along throughout the years, especially the railroads. A judicious selection of unusual and most interesting maps adds much to every chapter on the carriers and greatly enriches the whole volume. Stagecoach days are only referred to in writing of the turnpikes. It seems rather a pity that someone does not make a study and produce a history of those old rough-riding ships of the highways that for so many years served as the principal means of conveyance. The State Historical Society is to be congratulated upon having been able to secure for this undertaking a man of so much experience and ability.

G. A. RUSSELL

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT FROM MAY, 1785, THROUGH JANUARY, 1789. Compiled in accordance with an act of the General Assembly by *Leonard Woods Labaree*, State Historian. [Records of the State of Connecticut, Volume VI.] (Hartford, published by the state, 1945, pp. xv, 642, \$5.00.) These "records of the positive actions" of each session of the General Assembly of Connecticut during the concluding years of "the critical period" are of especial significance because they cover the meeting of the Federal Convention at Philadelphia and the ratification of the Federal Constitution by Connecticut. The defects of the Articles of Confederation were becoming increasingly apparent. Despite the hearty attachment of the good people of Connecticut to the Union, in October, 1786, the General Assembly refused to comply with the financial requisition of Congress. Connecticut was unrepresented at the Annapolis Convention of 1786, but when Congress recommended that the states appoint delegates to a convention to meet at Philadelphia in May, 1787, to revise the Articles of Confederation, the General Assembly of Connecticut appointed three delegates and gave them £600 to meet their expenses. When the Federal Convention reported and Congress transmitted the Constitution to be ratified by conventions in each state, the General Assembly authorized such a convention to meet at Hartford on Thursday, January 3, 1788. After a seven-day session, this convention ratified the Constitution by a vote of 128 to 40. Upon ratification of the Constitution by the required number of states, the General Assembly took steps to bring the new government into operation in Connecticut. So carefully have the records been edited that a resolution of the General Assembly incorporating the town of Thompson, inadvertently omitted from the manuscript records, has been supplied by the editor from the archives of the state. In reconstructing from contemporary newspapers "as complete an account as now seems possible of the proceedings and speeches" at the Connecticut ratifying convention, of which no official record is known to exist, the editor has contributed to knowledge of the adoption of the Federal Constitution. The format of the volume is excellent.

ISABEL M. CALDER

NEW YORK ADVANCING: SEVEN MORE YEARS OF PROGRESSIVE ADMINISTRATION IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 1939-1945, F. H. LA GUARDIA, MAYOR. Edited by *Rebecca B. Rankin*. (New York, Municipal Reference Library, 1945, pp. xxxv, 393, \$1.00.)

A LETTER BY DR. BENJAMIN RUSH DESCRIBING THE CONSECRATION OF THE GERMAN COLLEGE AT LANCASTER IN JUNE, 1787. Printed, with an Introduction and Notes, from a newly discovered Manuscript, now in the Fackenthal Library at Franklin and Marshall College. (Lancaster, Pa., published by order of the College, 1945, pp. viii, 37, \$2.50.)

PENNSYLVANIA'S SECOND YEAR AT WAR, DECEMBER 7, 1942-DECEMBER 7, 1943. By *S. K. Stevens*, *Marvin W. Schlegel*, and *Joseph T. Kingston*. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1945, pp. vii, 175.)

#### ARTICLES

- ELMER MUNSON HUNT. Abbot-Downing and the Concord Coach. *Hist. New Hampshire*, Nov.  
 GABRIEL NADEAU. A German Military Surgeon in Rutland, Massachusetts, during the Revolution: Julius Friedrich Wasmus. *Bull. Hist. Medicine*, Oct.  
 MARY KENT DAVEY BABCOCK. Organs and Organ Builders of Christ Church, Boston: 1735-1945. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Sept.  
*Id.* Early Organists of Christ Church, Boston: 1736-1824. *Ibid.*

- MARY PLUMMER SALSMAN. The Rev. Roger Price (1696-1762), Commissary to New England (1730-1748). *Ibid.*
- GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP. Samuel Sewall and the New England Company. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- RICHARD TUTT. Washington's Fleet and Marblehead's Part in Its Creation. *Essex Inst. Hist. Colls.*, Oct.
- JAMES DUNCAN PHILLIPS. The Voyage of the *Margaret* in 1801: The First Salem Voyage to Japan. *Proc. Am. Antiquarian Soc.*, Oct., 1944.
- FREDERICK W. COBURN. Theodore Edson (1793-1883) and His Diary. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Dec.
- EDWARD C. KIRKLAND. The "Railroad Scheme" of Massachusetts. *Jour. Ec. Hist.*, Nov.
- ROBERT LINCOLN O'BRIEN. The Last Half Century of Transcript History. *Proc. Massachusetts Hist. Soc.*, LXVII (1941-44), 1945.
- WILLIAM B. WILLCOX. Rhode Island in British Strategy, 1780-1781. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.
- WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY. John Williams (1817-1899), Bishop of Connecticut (1865-1899). *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.
- JANE LAPE. Champlain Valley—The War Path of the Nations. *Bull. New York State Hist. Assoc.*, Nov.
- WALTER P. ROGERS. The People's College Movement in New York State. *New York Hist.*, Oct.
- IRA D. LANDIS. Mennonite Agriculture in Colonial Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: The First Intensive Agriculture in America. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Oct.
- RUSSELL E. FRANCIS. The Religious Revival of 1858 in Philadelphia. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Jan.
- WINNIFRED K. MACKEY. Philadelphia during the Civil War, 1861-1865. *Ibid.*
- JOSEPH JACKSON. Building Philadelphia's Cathedral. *Recs. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Sept.
- J. H. POWELL. John Dickinson, President of the Delaware State, 1781-1782. *Delaware Hist.*, Jan.

## DOCUMENTS

- Journal of Capt. John Crowninshield at Calcutta, 1797-1798, when Master of the Ship "Belisarius" [1]. *Essex Inst. Hist. Colls.*, Oct.
- Journal of William Wait Oliver of Salem, 1802-1803 [cont.]. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM A. ELLIS. The Diary of William S. Pennington [May 4, 1780-Mar. 23, 1781]. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, Oct., Jan.
- ELMER T. HUTCHINSON. Marginal Jottings from the Almanacs of the Scudder Family [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Oct., Jan.
- OTTO CHOMET. Citizen Marsillac on Philadelphia. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Jan.
- L. H. BUTTERFIELD. A Survey of the Benjamin Rush Papers. *Ibid.*
- LEON DE VALINGER, JR. Minutes of the Delaware Council of Safety. *Delaware Hist.*, Jan.

## SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

THE PERILOUS FIGHT. By Neil Harmon Swanson. (New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1945, pp. 568, \$3.50.) "An episode from the War of 1812, Samuel Smith's organization of Baltimore's defense against the British. 'Recounted mainly from contemporary records.'"

AN ESSAY UPON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ENGLISH PLANTATIONS ON THE CONTINENT OF AMERICA (1701): AN ANONYMOUS VIRGINIAN'S PROPOSALS FOR LIBERTY UNDER THE BRITISH CROWN, WITH TWO MEMORANDA BY WILLIAM BYRD. Edited by Louis B. Wright. (San Marino, Calif., Huntington Library, 1945, pp. xxiv, 66, \$2.50.) This essay on colonial government, "by an American," was published in London in 1701, when the Board of Trade and other British governmental agencies were wrestling with the problem of royalizing all the colonies. It was probably written by Robert Beverley, Virginia planter and

historian, though Mr. Wright produces some evidence to show that William Byrd II, or even the elder William Byrd, might have had a hand in it. The *Essay* was probably intended as a refutation to the arguments for proprietaries advanced by Charles Davenant's *Discourses on the Publick Revenues, and on the Trade of England* (1698), a publication obviously hostile to Virginia and biased in favor of Pennsylvania and New York. In his introduction, Mr. Wright gives an excellent summary of the author's arguments for royalization, as well as his account of colonial grievances and proposed remedies therefor. Among these grievances were: arbitrary and tyrannical conduct of "some governors"; lack of full religious liberty, especially in Pennsylvania; violations of trade laws, particularly by the northern colonies, which were "scandalously addicted to smuggling"; insufficient encouragement of immigration; unsatisfactory regulation of Indian trade; confusion of laws; and the lack of a system for handling inter-colonial problems. The author insists that most of these problems were due to the ignorance of America by English authorities, and "if the government understood the true state of affairs, grievances would be promptly redressed." "The crying need of the colonies," the *Essay* maintains, is some "unifying law," and, to achieve this objective, it suggests that "a certain method be established": to decide all intercolonial controversies; to provide for the extradition of fugitives—servants, slaves, and criminals; and to adjust all trade disputes. It also proposes a plan of union, which would establish a "convention," based on proportional representation, to handle intercolonial problems, and the appointment of a "travelling commissioner" who would make periodic reports to the Board of Trade on the conduct of colonial administration. The central theme of the whole *Essay* is the "identity of interest of England and the colonies." Its republication under such competent editorship is another welcome contribution by the Huntington Library.

HUGH T. LEFLER

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MISSISSIPPI IMPRINTS, 1798-1830. By Douglas C. McMurtrie. [Heartman's Historical Series, No. 69.] (Beauvoir Community, Miss., Book Farm, 1945, pp. 168, \$7.50.)

JOURNALS OF THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS, 1841-1842, TO WHICH ARE ADDED THE SPECIAL LAWS. Volume I, THE SENATE JOURNAL; Volume II, THE HOUSE JOURNAL; Volume III, JOURNALS CALLED SESSION REPORTS AND SPECIAL LAWS. Edited by Harriet Smither, Archivist, Texas State Library. (Austin, Library and Historical Commission, Texas State Library, 1940, 1944, 1945, pp. vi, 377, 472, 521, \$3.00 per volume.)

#### ARTICLES

LOUIS DOW SCISCO. The Discovery of the Chesapeake Bay, 1525-1573. *Maryland Hist. Mag.* Dec.

ETHEL ROBY HAYDEN. Port Tobacco, Lost Town of Maryland. *Ibid.*

CHARLES BRANCH CLARK. Politics in Maryland during the Civil War [cont.]. *Ibid.*

G. MACLAREN BRYDON. Parson Sclater and His Vestry. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

ALEXANDER WILBOURNE WEDDELL. Samuel Mordecai, Chronicler of Richmond, 1786-1865. *Ibid.*

GEORGE CARRINGTON MASON. The Colonial Churches of New Kent and Hanover Counties, Virginia. *Ibid.*

MARIE KIMBALL. Some Genial Old Drinking Customs. *William and Mary Quar.*, Oct.

DONALD ROBERT COME. The Influence of Princeton on Higher Education in the South before 1825. *Ibid.*

MILTON GEROFISKY. Reconstruction in West Virginia [II]. *West Virginia Hist.*, Oct.

LEWIS H. CHRISMAN. The Origin of Place Names in West Virginia. *Ibid.*, Jan.

- L. J. PRIESTLEY. Sesqui-Centennial Celebration of the Treaty of Greene Ville [July 29-Aug. 3, 1945]. *Ibid.*
- ALONZO THOMAS DILL, JR. Eighteenth Century New Bern: A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800, Part IV: Years of Slow Development. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- R. L. HILLDRUP. The Salt Supply of North Carolina during the American Revolution. *Ibid.*
- JAY MONAGHAN. North Carolinians in Illinois History. *Ibid.*
- HELEN E. LIVINGSTON. Thomas Morritt, Schoolmaster of the Charleston [South Carolina] Free School, 1723-1728. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.
- W. STANLEY HOOLE. Charleston Theatricals during the Tragic Decade, 1860-1869. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- PAUL MURRAY. Party Organization in Georgia Politics, 1825-1853. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- RALPH ALBERTSON. The Christian Commonwealth in Georgia. *Ibid.*, Sept.
- ARTHUR LINK. The Democratic Pre-Convention Campaign of 1912 in Georgia. *Ibid.*
- T. FREDERICK DAVIS. Pioneer Florida: An Interpretation of Spanish Laws and Land Tides. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- JOSEPH B. LOCKEY. The Florida Banditti, 1783. *Ibid.*
- NASH KERR BURGER. The Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Mississippi [1827-61]. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Sept.
- WILLIE D. HALSELL. The Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- LAURA L. PORTEOUS and WALTER PRICHARD. Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, LXXXI. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- J. VILLASANA HAGGARD. The Neutral Ground between Louisiana and Texas, 1806-1821. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES W. HACKETT. The Marquis of San Miguel de Aguayo and His Recovery of Texas from the French, 1719-1723. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- JOSEPH W. HALE. Masonry in the Early Days of Texas. *Ibid.*, Jan.
- CHARLES F. ARROWOOD. The Election of Jefferson Davis to the Presidency of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- PAUL ADAMS. Amelia Barr in Texas, 1856-1868. *Ibid.*, Jan.
- C. STANLEY BANKS. The Mormon Migration into Texas. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- WALTER McCausland. Some Early Texas Newspapers. *Ibid.*, Jan.
- LLERENA FRIEND. Contemporary Newspaper Accounts of the Annexation of Texas. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- SIDNEY JAMES ROMERO, JR. The Political Career of Murphy James Foster, Governor of Louisiana, 1892-1900. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- J. C. DYKES. Dime Novel Texas: Or, the Sub-Literature of the Lone Star State. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- S. S. WILCOX. The Spanish Archives of Laredo. *Ibid.*

## DOCUMENTS

- ROSAMOND RANDALL BEIRNE. Three War Letters [Richard Kidder Meade, 1780; Henry Knapp Randall, 1813; John Eager Howard Post, 1862]. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Dec.
- FLETCHER MELVIN GREEN. A People at War: Hagerstown, Maryland, June 15-August 31, 1863 [the diary of Miss Lutie Kealhofer]. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR. An Autobiographical Application for Employment, 1788. *William and Mary Quar.*, Oct.
- ROSS B. JOHNSTON. West Virginians in the American Revolution [Shaw to Stewart]. *West Virginia Hist.*, Oct., Jan.
- EMMA FRANCES ALDERSON. The Minutes of the Greenbrier Baptist Church, 1781-1832. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- JAMES A. PADGETT. Life of Alfred Mordecai in Mexico in 1865-1866, as Told in His Letters to His Family, Part III. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- EDMUND CODY BURNETT. Letters of a Confederate Surgeon: Dr. Abner Embury McGarity, 1862-1865 [I, II, III]. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, June, Sept., Dec.
- Mrs. M. A. JOHNSON. A Diary of Joshua Nicholson Glenn: St. Augustine in 1823. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

W. T. CASH. Tallahassee and St. Marks in 1841: A Letter of John S. Tappan. *Ibid.*

JULIA KATHRYN GARRETT. Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814 [cont.]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct., Jan.

M. L. CRIMMINS. Texas Items in the *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 1836. *Ibid.*, Jan.

E. W. WINKLER. Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876 [XI]. *Ibid.*, Oct.

#### WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

A HISTORY OF TUSCULUM COLLEGE, 1794-1944. By *Allen E. Ragan*, Professor of History. (Greenville, Tenn., Tusculum Sesquicentennial Committee, 1945, pp. x, 274.)

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY CENTENNIAL HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE. By *Frederick Clayton Waite*, Professor Emeritus in Western Reserve University. (Cleveland, Western Reserve University Press, 1946, pp. xiii, 588, \$6.00.) The author has made his history of a medical school in Cleveland throw light on the educational and social history of the region in the nineteenth century.

INDIANA PUBLIC OPINION AND THE WORLD WAR, 1914-1917. By *Cedric C. Cummins*. [Indiana Historical Collections, Volume XXVIII.] (Indianapolis, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1945, pp. xvii, 292, \$2.00.) Several characteristics of the middle westerners were clearly revealed under the strain of the years 1914-1917. Their love of peace and their nationalism, which have generally been recognized, were again made clear. Their unpreparedness to think about international events, the extent to which their racial, religious, economic, and political connections determined their thinking, and the wide influence which prosperity rather unconsciously had upon their decisions, have not been so readily noted. These, as well as the failure of German propaganda, the small effect of the Bryce report about Belgium, and the clerical justification of war, are some of the points brought out in this study. The middle westerners took their stand on business as usual, neutral rights, and nationalism, unafraid and unprepared, unaware of what the costs would be, passively waiting for either side to commit the aggressive acts that would bring war to their homes but hopeful that they would remain at peace, that the Allies would be victorious, and that if war came to them the things they valued most would be protected and democracy advanced. This small volume is the initial work of a young scholar. Its virtues are many, its faults few. Among the latter are the failures to point out its relation to other works in the field and the differences between the picture here presented and that already advanced in other studies. The author is well informed about the people of Indiana and the events of the period. He writes well, thoughtfully, even philosophically. His examination of fifty some weekly newspapers as well as numerous daily papers and periodicals has given him an intimate view of the reactions of the people. The Indiana Historical Bureau has given the author's work a neat and dignified presentation in a very acceptable volume.

JOHN D. BARNHART

THE CITY OF FLINT GROWS UP: THE SUCCESS STORY OF AN AMERICAN COMMUNITY. By *Carl Crow*. (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1945, pp. xii, 217, \$3.00.) Less than forty pages on Flint's history as a center for lumber, wagons, two-wheeled carts, and whip sockets. The rest is a glowing account of the Buick Motor Company, now a division of General Motors.

THIS IS THE PLACE: UTAH. By *Maurine Whipple*. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1945, pp. 222, \$5.00.) In no state other than Utah is so dramatic and exciting a folklore matched by an equally extravagant scenic wonderland. Maurine Whipple, in *This Is*



*the Place: Utah*, has employed a hundred photographs and a lively, informal text to describe this "peculiar people" and the breath-taking, savage land that they colonized. One need not know Utah to savor the photographs—from the sunset over Great Salt Lake to the incredible monoliths of Monument Valley—but those who have seen Mormon Country will experience here a renewal of past pleasures and a compelling invitation to repeat them. Miss Whipple's narrative runs from a romantic dramatization of the arrival of Brigham Young in the Great Basin to a sharply ironic commentary on the barrenness of modern Mormon leadership. She contrasts the severe isolationism of the early Mormon group with the ardent patriotism of Mormons during this war but emphasizes that despite the dissolving of Mormon antagonism toward the federal government these people have nevertheless not sacrificed their specific culture. The book is full of amusing, amazing, and sometimes satiric stories. Miss Whipple's gift for the vivid phrase is employed without stint. Her remarks on the generally satisfactory nature of polygamous relations will come as a surprise to those who have read her *Giant Joshua*, which was a magnificent novel of the hideous tragedies of polygamy. And historians will be annoyed by petty errors of fact: Devil's Slide is in Weber, not Ogden Canyon, and the "Nauvoo Millennial Star of 1834" actually began publication in Liverpool, England, in 1840 and was never printed in Nauvoo. But this book is not meant to be history. It is a book of personal impressions recorded during a tour of the state which covered the Salt Flats, Temple Square, the Dinosaur Country, and the wild, almost inaccessible phantasmagoria of the southern mesas. And because the author's eye is sensitive and her sense of humor omnipresent, these impressions not only make good reading but also frequently show more discernment and shrewd understanding than a more carefully wrought history.

FAWN M. BRODIE

FRAY ALONSO DE BENAVIDES' REVISED MEMORIAL OF 1634, WITH NUMEROUS SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS ELABORATELY ANNOTATED. By Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, Agapito Rey. [Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, Volume IV.] (Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1945, pp. xvi, 368, \$6.00.) On this volume, which includes the first English translation of an important historical work relating to New Mexico, is focused the erudition of three outstanding scholars of the Spanish Southwest. The result is a notable contribution. The core of this volume and the inspiration for all that is contributed by the editors is the English translation of Father Benavides' 1634 *Memorial*. This is so completely a revision of his earlier *Memorial* of 1630 that it constitutes an entirely new work. Much information concerning the pre-1630 history of New Mexico is found in the 1634 *Memorial* that is not referred to in the one of 1630; for example, the account of the disposition of the Pueblo "nations" to the friars who accompanied Oñate in 1598 (pp. 59-61). Father Benavides wrote the 1634 *Memorial* especially for Pope Urban VIII. The object was to set forth the condition of the missions of New Mexico and to portray—for the purpose of securing special favors and concessions—the extent and hardship of the work, the large number of martyrs, and the history of those missions. This volume contains a "Biography of Benavides" (pp. 1-17) and a "Bibliography of the Memorial of 1630" (pp. 19-34). Nowhere else is to be found as full a biography of Benavides. An apparent error, however, is found on page 7 where the date "May 15, 1621" obviously should be May 15, 1631. A notable contribution is the translation of twenty-five documents, comprised in as many appendixes (pp. 105-221), that were written between 1609 and 1633. These relate in the main to Father Benavides, before, during, and after his tenure as custodian

of New Mexico. One section of this volume comprises "Editorial Notes" (pp. 223-320). As stated in the foreword: "Many of the explanatory notes of the Ayer translation of the Memorial of 1630 are . . . incorporated in the present work, but these notes have been rewritten in view of the additional information not available in 1916." For example, note 17 (pp. 213-16) in the 1630 edition, which relates to the Piro tribe, is practically identical, for the first three paragraphs, with note 72 (pp. 246-48). The last two pages of the note on the Piro in the present volume contain a long quotation (pp. 250-52) from a post-1916 study. Extremely useful is the section entitled "Works Consulted," which concludes the volume. There are to be found bibliographical data regarding approximately three hundred separate works that relate in the main to New Mexico. Of these, approximately one third were published before 1916. All students of southwestern history will be grateful for the completeness of the bibliographical data included here. In format this volume measures up to the high standards set in the earlier publications of this series.

CHARLES WILSON HACKETT

MEMOIRS OF ELISHA OSCAR CROSBY: REMINISCENCES OF CALIFORNIA AND GUATEMALA FROM 1849 TO 1864. Edited by *Charles Albro Barker*. (San Marino, Huntington Library, 1945, pp. xxvi, 119, \$2.75.)

THE JESUITS IN OLD OREGON, 1840-1940: A SKETCH OF JESUIT ACTIVITIES IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST. By *William N. Bischoff*, Gonzaga University. (Caldwell, Idaho, Caxton Printers, 1945, pp. xvii, 258, \$3.00.) Ten years ago, when Professor Herbert E. Bolton outlined a program of research at the inaugural of the Institute of Jesuit History in Loyola University, he proposed, among other things, the writing of regional studies for different parts of the American West. Here is one such study by an author who studied both at Loyola and at Gonzaga University, the chief Catholic research center in the Pacific Northwest. In its general conception the book fits very nicely into the broad plan envisaged by Professor Bolton and Father Garraghan. Introductory chapters carry the story of De Smet's exploratory journeys and the founding of the early missions among the Flatheads and beyond the Rocky Mountains. The organization of the remainder of the volume is geographical, chapters or sections of chapters being devoted to the various missions in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, also Wyoming and South Dakota. Limitations of space prevent the author from giving more than a brief sketch of each one, but bits of local color and quotations from contemporary records describe the work of the missionaries in giving religious instruction and their efforts to improve the conditions of life generally for the Indians among whom they lived. Individual biographical sketches of the priests are given in an appendix. The account throughout is based upon an examination of authentic Catholic sources both printed and archival. The shortcomings of the book are in a measure the result of the author's decision to adopt a geographical treatment. It is difficult to give an analysis of the problems facing the Jesuits in the region as a whole while discussing conditions existing at particular missions. Here and there are sidelights on the relations of the Catholics with the fur traders, white settlers, army officers, and Protestant missionaries, but nowhere is there a general interpretation of Jesuit policy. Nor is there an adequate indication of the Catholic interest in the administration of Indian agencies by the federal government. These are important matters and many readers will wish that more attention had been paid to them. They will wish, too, for a clearer view of the rise and decline of the missionary movement in this part of the country, and for a more satisfying appraisal of the historical position of the Jesuits in the development of the region. To do this without entering into sectarian controversy may be difficult, but it is not im-

possible. A stronger exposition of the Catholic point of view, offered with a broad perspective, would have been a more valuable contribution to an understanding of the missionary era in the Far Northwest.

CHARLES M. GATES

ARTICLES

- SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS. The Admission of Tennessee into the Union. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.  
 Mrs. JOHN TROTWOOD MOORE. Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1810 [concl.]. *Ibid.*
- STANLEY J. FOLMSBEE. Blount College and East Tennessee College, 1794-1840: The First Predecessors of the University of Tennessee. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publ.*, 1945.
- LAURA E. LUTTRELL. One Hundred Years of a Female Academy: The Knoxville Female Academy, 1811-1846; The East Tennessee Female Institute, 1846-1911. *Ibid.*
- THOMAS D. CLARK. The Country Store in Post-Civil War Tennessee. *Ibid.*
- SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS. George Roulstone: Father of the Tennessee Press. *Ibid.*
- HOWARD DITTRICK. Cleveland Doctors and Their Fees [about 1840]. *Ohio State Archaeol. and Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- PHILIP D. JORDAN. Purveyors to the Profession: Cincinnati Drug Houses, 1850-1860. *Ibid.*
- ADOLPH E. WALLER. Ohio Medical History, Part 6: The Vaulting Imagination of John L. Riddell. *Ibid.*
- FRED LANDON. Over Lake Erie to Freedom. *Northwest Ohio Quar.*, Oct.
- ELFRIEDA LANG. Conditions of Travel Experienced by German Immigrants to Dubois County, Indiana. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, Dec.
- MARTHA F. BELLINGER. Music in Indianapolis, 1821-1900. *Ibid.*
- LAURA LANGEHENNIG. The Steamboat: A Playground for St. Louis in the Fifties. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- R. L. BRIGHAM. Negro Education in Ante-Bellum Missouri. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Oct.
- MINNIE M. BRASHER. Missouri Literature since the First World War [I]. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- STANLEY FAYE. Indian Guests at the Spanish Arkansas Post. *Arkansas Hist. Quar.*, Summer.
- ROBERT L. MORRIS. Three Arkansas Travellers [Timothy Flint, Washington Irving, and Frederick Gerstaecker]. *Ibid.*, Autumn.
- JAMES H. ATKINSON. The Brooks-Baxter Contest [1872]. *Ibid.*, Summer.
- MRS. F. M. WILLIAMS. Andrew Hunter, Pioneer Methodist (1813-1902). *Ibid.*, Autumn.
- LOUIS C. KARPINSKI. Early Michigan Maps: Three Outstanding Peculiarities. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Oct.
- CARL E. PRAY, JR. The Contributions of Governor Shelby and the People of Kentucky to the Freedom of Michigan in the War of 1812. *Ibid.*
- WAYNE E. STEVENS. The Michigan Fur Trade. *Ibid.*
- LEW ALLEN CHASE. Michigan Copper Mines. *Ibid.*
- JOHN COX, JR. The Quakers in Michigan. *Ibid.*
- STELLANOVA OSBORN. A Conference on Michigan Politics at the Little White House, Warm Springs, Georgia. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- JACOB A. SWISHER. Mining in Iowa. *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol.*, Oct.
- CHARLES E. SNYDER. Forgotten Men: James L. Thompson. *Ibid.*
- EMORY H. ENGLISH. As Iowa Approached Statehood. *An. Iowa*, Jan.
- O. H. RALEIGH. Northern Iowa One Hundred Years Ago. *Ibid.*
- LILLIAN KRUEGER. Motherhood on the Wisconsin Frontier [I]. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, Dec.
- W. B. FAHERTY. Sacred Heart College of Prairie du Chien, 1880-1888. *Ibid.*
- DOROTHY GANFIELD FOWLER. Wisconsin's Carroll College. *Ibid.*
- LLOYD A. WILFORD. The Prehistoric Indians of Minnesota: The Headwaters Lakes Aspect. *Minnesota Hist.*, Dec.
- JOHN T. FLANAGAN. Early Literary Periodicals in Minnesota. *Ibid.*
- CORA DOLBEE. Kansas and "The Prairied West" of John G. Whittier. *Essex Inst. Hist. Colls.*, Oct.
- THEODORE SALOUTOS. The Montana Society of Equity. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- WARDNER G. SCOTT. Nebraska Public Highways. *Nebraska Hist.*, July.

- MERRILL J. MATTES, Hiram Scott, Fur Trader. *Ibid.*  
 FINIS E. DOWNING. With the Ute Peace Delegation of 1863, across the Plains and at Conejos. *Colorado Mag.*, Sept.  
 RAY H. COOPER. Early History of San Juan County. *Ibid.*  
 MARY PROWERS HUDNALL. Early History of Bent County. *Ibid.*, Nov.  
 MARY RAIT. Development of the Peach Industry in the Colorado River Valley. *Ibid.*  
 ANNIE LAURIE BIRD. A Footnote on the Capitol Dispute in Idaho. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Oct.  
 NORMAN ARTHUR GRAEBNER. Pioneer Indian Agriculture in Oklahoma. *Chron. Oklahoma*, Autumn.  
 L. P. BOBO. Reminiscences of Pioneer Days. *Ibid.*  
 MURIEL H. WRIGHT. Origin of Oklahoma Day. *Ibid.*  
 OSCAR A. KINCHEN. The Abortive Territory of Cimarron [1886]. *Ibid.*  
 LILLIE G. MCKINNEY. History of the Albuquerque Indian School [concl.]. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, Oct.  
 PETER GERHARD. Baja California in the Mexican War, 1846-1848. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.  
 HENRY H. SIMMS. The Controversy over the Admission of the State of Oregon. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.  
 O. LARSELL. History of Care of Insane in the State of Oregon. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, Dec.  
 ALFRED L. LOMAX. The Ashland Woolen Mills from 1868 to 1900. *Ibid.*  
 LEWIS A. MCARTHUR. Oregon Geographic Names: Additions since 1944. *Ibid.*  
 SAMUEL R. MOHLER. Boom Days in Ellensburg, 1888-1891. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Oct.

## DOCUMENTS

- COLTON STORM. Up the Tennessee in 1790: The Report of Major John Doughty to the Secretary of War. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publ.*, 1945.  
 ENOCH L. MITCHELL. Letters of a Confederate Surgeon in the Army of Tennessee to His Wife [I]. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.  
 NEIL E. SALSICH. The Siege of Fort Meigs, Year 1813: An Eye-Witness Account by Colonel Alexander Bourne. *Northwest Ohio Quar.*, Oct.  
 M. HAMLIN CANNON. Bankruptcy Proceedings against Joseph Smith in Illinois. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.  
 MARIE GEORGE WINDELL. The Road West in 1818: The Diary of Henry Vest Bingham [concl.]. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Oct., Jan.  
 DOROTHY PENN. The Missouri Reader: The French in the Valley [I]. *Ibid.*, Oct.  
 HENRY S. LUCAS. The Journey of an Immigrant Family from the Netherlands to Milwaukee in 1854. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, Dec.  
 LANSING B. BLOOM. From Lewisburg to California in 1849 [concl.]. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, Oct.  
 ELEANOR RUTH ROCKWOOD. Oregon Document Check List, VIII: Officials, Boards. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, Dec.  
 Edmund Sylvester's Narrative of the Founding of Olympia. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Oct.

## Latin-American History

John J. Johnson

## GENERAL

- BIBLIOGRAFIAS CUBANAS. Por Fermín Peraza y Sarausa, Director de la Biblioteca Municipal de la Habana. [Library of Congress, Hispanic Foundation, Latin American Series No. 7.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. xiv, 58, 20 cents.) Latin America has much to its credit in the bibliography of the Western world. Past achievements are real encouragement for further advances. Sr. Peraza y Sarausa, the

head of the city library of Havana, is a promising addition to the goodly bibliographical group of Bachiller y Morales and Trelles as native Cubans, with Medina and others from off-island sources, not to forget mention of contributions from the Library of Congress. The present list is a result of the author's visit to the United States in the spring of 1944 on the invitation of the Department of State and the Library of Congress as consultant in Cuban bibliography. It includes 485 items, divided into general, subject, personal groups, happily clinched by a good index. With this at hand and the *Anuario bibliografico cubano* issued by the author since 1937 the student will be spared much searching of sources and guides. It is an encouraging contribution to the bibliography of the island, though scarcely to be accepted as absolutely complete and final. For instance, LeRoy y Cassa's bibliography of Surgeon General Sternberg is noted (470), but never a word about the imposing eight pages of bibliography in Mrs. Sternberg's memorial of her husband (1920). Cuba played some part in the life of Walter Reed, but no mention is made of the ten-page bibliography in L. N. Wood's *Walter Reed: Doctor in Uniform* (1943), or Howard A. Kelly's life of Reed (1906; 3d ed., 1923; each with three pages of bibliography). One would think that at least passing mention should have been made to such sources as *Writings on American History* for the period since 1902. Or, the references to Cuba in the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, *passim*. A word of explanation in the introduction telling about the plan and scope of the work would have cleared up such difficulties or misunderstandings, pointing out just what might be expected and where no attempt had been made to cover. It is correct to call it "Bibliografías cubanas," not correct to say it is a bibliography of bibliographies about Cuba. One might wish that in design of the booklet some attention had been given to running page heads. It is encouraging to note that continuations are aimed at in the fields of music, manuscripts, maps, prints.

HARRY M. LYDENBERG

**SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE ON BRAZIL OF SOCIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE PUBLISHED UP TO 1940.** Edited for the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the National Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Social Science Research Council by *Donald Pierson*. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945, pp. xvi, 60, \$1.50.) While the general introductory statement limits the work to sociology as "a limited and not an inclusive discipline," it also states that at present sociological investigation in Brazil owes much to social historians (as well as other groups of scholars). The social historians in turn may wish to consult this bibliography.

#### ARTICLES

- B. BONNET REVERÓN. Las expediciones a las Canarias en el siglo XIV [cont.]. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Apr., 1945.
- ENRIQUE RIOJA. Apostillas de un naturalista a la relación del primer viaje del "Almirante de la mar oceana." *Cuadernos Americanos* (México, D. F.), Nov.
- WILLIAM B. GREENLEE. The Background of Brazilian History. *Americas*, Oct.
- CHARLES EDWARD NOWELL. The Treaty of Tordesillas and the Diplomatic Background of American History. *Greater America: Essays in Honor of Herbert Eugene Bolton*, 1945.
- JAMES FERGUSON KING. Negro Slavery in New Granada. *Ibid.*
- ENRIQUE ALVAREZ LÓPEZ. Las plantas de América en la botánica europea del siglo XVI. *Rev. Indias*, Apr., 1945.
- IONE STUESSY WRIGHT. Early Spanish Voyages from America to the Far East, 1527-1565. *Greater America*.
- JUSTO PÉREZ. Guía histórica para el estudio de la institución del Obispado de Honduras. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July.

- JEROME VINCENT JACOBSEN. Educational Foundations of the Jesuits in Colonial Hispanic America. *Greater America*.
- THEODORE EDWARD TREUTLEIN. Non-Spanish Jesuits in Spain's American Colonies. *Ibid.*
- JOSÉ MARÍA OTS. España en América: del absolutismo de los Austrias al despotismo de los Borbones. *Rev. América* (Bogotá), Nov.
- JOSÉ A. RAMOS MARTÍNEZ. Anales eclesiásticos. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.* (Caracas), Apr., 1945.
- JOHN HASKELL KEMBLE. Mail Steamers Link the Americas, 1840-1890. *Greater America*.
- FRANCIS COLT DE WOLF. The Development of Telecommunications in the Americas. *Bull. Pan Am. Union*, Dec.
- LUIS QUINTANILLA. La doctrina Monroe. Propósito y realidad. *Rev. América*, Nov.
- JOSÉ MARÍA MARTÍNEZ VAL. El paisaje geográfico en los historiadores de Indias. *Rev. Indias*, Apr., 1945.
- DOMINGO AMUNÁTEGUI SOLAR. La obra histórica de Barros Arana. *Rev. Chilena Hist. Geog.* (Santiago), Jan., 1945.
- ARTHUR S. AITON. Philip Ainsworth Means, 1892-1944. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- JOSÉ SANCHEZ. La diferencia entre los términos América Latina e Hispanoamérica. *Rev. América*, Nov.
- TORIBIO ESQUIVEL OBREGÓN. El destino de México. *Jus* (México, D. F.), July.
- The Map of Hispanic America on the Scale of 1:1,000,000. *Geog. Rev.*, Jan.
- E. W. JAMES. A Quarter Century of Road Building in the Americas. *Bull. Pan Am. Union*, Nov.
- The Americas and the War (Parts XLIV-XLV). *Ibid.*, Nov., Dec.
- Petición de corsarios mallorquines para América [1686]. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Apr., 1945.

## INDEXES, BIBLIOGRAPHY, AND ARCHIVE GUIDES

- Índice del ramo de tierras, volúmenes 1511 a 1520 [cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), Apr., July, 1945.
- Índices [archival *ramos* of Encomiendas; Gobernación y Capitanía General; Reales Provisiones; Compañía Guipuzcoana; Intendencia de Ejército y Real Hacienda; Hojas Militares; Gobernación de Guayana; República de Venezuela, Secretaría del Interior y Justicia; cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), Mar., May, 1945.
- Encomiendas, tomo II [cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Hist. Prov. Mérida*, Jan., 1945.
- Real hacienda. Catálogo de los expedientes existentes en el Archivo Histórico de la provincia de Mérida. Bulto no. 33, 34, 35 [1622-1816], *Ibid.*
- Reales provisiones (Existentes en el Archivo Histórico de Bogotá y sus copias en la Universidad de los Andes). Tomo II [1656-69; cont.]. *Ibid.*
- LAURA L. PORTEOUS. Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, LXXXI. May, 1785 [cont.]. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- A. P. CANABRAVA. Ensaio bibliográfico sobre as bandeiras. *Bol. Bibl.* (São Paulo), Oct., 1944.
- Índice de los documentos existentes en el Archivo General del Gobierno [1784-98; cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.* (Guatemala City), June.
- El "Theatro de la Nueva España en su gentilismo y conquista" de Diego Panes. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.
- SEB. S. WILCOX. The Spanish Archives of Laredo. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- Índice de documentos del período federal independiente existente en los Archivos Nacionales de Costa Rica, ya catalogados [1824, 1825]. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica* (San José), July, Sept.
- MARTIN E. ERICKSON. Some Little-known Guatemalan Publications. *Hispania*, Nov.
- PEDRO HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA, DORA GUIMPEL, y MARÍA MUÑOZ GUILMART. La literatura en los periódicos argentinos. *Rev. Univ. Buenos Aires*, Apr., 1945.
- La colección Trujillo. *Bol. Bibl. Dominicano* (Ciudad Trujillo), July.
- A Bibliography of the Writings of Herbert Eugene Bolton. *Greater America*.
- A Bibliography of the Historical Writings of the Students of Herbert Eugene Bolton. *Ibid.*



COLONIAL PERIOD

NORTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

ARTICLES

- ROBERT E. SMITH. Importancia de la cerámica de Uaxactún en la reconstrucción de la historia maya. *Rev. Guatemala*, Oct.
- JOAQUÍN MEADE. Panorama indiano de San Luis Potosí en la época prehispánica. *Bol. Soc. Mex. Geog. Estadística* (México, D. F.), July.
- ANTONIO FERNANDEZ DEL CASTILLO. Hernán Cortés y el Distrito Federal. *Ibid.*
- HENRY R. WAGNER. Three Studies on the Same Subject: Bernal Díaz del Castillo; The Family of Bernal Díaz del Castillo; Notes on Writings By and About Bernal Díaz del Castillo. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.
- VICENTE LLORENS CASTILLO. Vida cultural de Santo Domingo en el siglo XVI. *Cuadernos Dominicanos Cult.* (Ciudad Trujillo), June.
- TULIO VON BÜLOW. Apuntes para la historia de la medicina en Costa Rica durante la colonia [CONT.]. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica* (San José), Sept.
- JOSÉ IGNACIO RUBIO MAÑE. Campeche en la historia de Yucatán. *Bol. Soc. Mex. Geog. Estadística*, July.
- ROBERT S. CHAMBERLAIN. Ensayo sobre el adelantado don Francisco de Montejo y sus proyectos para el desarrollo económico de la provincia de Honduras e Higueras. *Rev. Guatemala*, Sept.
- WOODROW WILSON BORAH. Silk Culture in Colonial Mexico. *Greater America*.
- FRANCISCO DE LA MAZA. Fray Diego Valadés, escritor y grabador franciscano del siglo XVI. *Anales Inst. Invest. Estéticas* (México, D. F.), IV, no. 13.
- MANUEL TOUSSAINT. Fray Andrés de San Miguel, arquitecto de la Nueva España. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM EUGENE SHIELS. Gonzalo de Tapia (1561-1594), Jesuit Pioneer in New Spain. *Greater America*.
- CATHARINE MARY MCSHANE. Hernando de Santarén, S. J., Pioneer and Diplomat, 1565-1616. *Ibid.*
- PETER MASTEN DUNNE. Pioneer Jesuit Missionaries on the Central Plateau of New Spain. *Ibid.*
- JOHN FRANCIS BANNON. Pioneer Jesuit Missionaries on the Pacific Slope of New Spain. *Ibid.*
- HARRY PRESCOTT JOHNSON. Diego Martínez de Hurdaide, Defender of Spain's Pacific Coast Frontier. *Ibid.*
- CHESTER LYLE GUTHRIE. Riots in Seventeenth-Century Mexico City: A Study of Social and Economic Conditions. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES W. HACKETT. The Marquis of San Miguel de Aguayo and His Recovery of Texas from the French, 1719-1723. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- RUSSELL CHARLES EWING. The Pima Uprising of 1751: A Study of Spanish-Indian Relations on the Frontier of New Spain. *Greater America*.
- FLORENTINO PÉREZ EMBID. Complicaciones de la cocina virreinal de don Manuel de Amat en Lima. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Apr., 1945.
- G. DEBIEN. Gouverneurs, magistrats et colons. L'opposition parlementaire et coloniale à Saint-Domingue (1763-1769). *Revue Soc. d'Hist. Geog. d'Haiti* (Port-au-Prince), Oct.
- ERNESTO J. CASTILLERO R. Resultados de la expulsión de los Jesuitas de Panamá. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica*, Sept.
- LUIS CASTILLO LEDON. El puerto de San Blas, su fundación y su historia. *Bol. Soc. Mex. Geog. Estadística*, July.
- MARY A. O'CALLAGHAN. An Indian Removal Policy in Spanish Louisiana. *Greater America*.
- J. VILLASANA HAGGARD. The Neutral Ground between Louisiana and Texas, 1806-1821. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- RAMÓN IGLESIA. Estudios de historiografía de la Nueva España. *Filosofía y Letras* (México, D. F.), July.

DOCUMENTS

- FRANS BLOM. El lienzo de Analco, Oaxaca [conquest period]. *Cuadernos Americanos* (México, D. F.), Nov.

- FEDERICO LUNARDI. El valle de Comayagua, documentos para la historia [cont.]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July, Sept.
- [Documents concerning the construction and history of various churches in Central America, 16th to 18th centuries.] *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.* (Guatemala City), June.
- Estado en que se hallaba la provincia de Coatzacoalcos en el año de 1599 [concl.]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), Apr., July, 1945.
- Relación de la provincia de Nuestra Señora de Sinaloa.—1601. *Ibid.*, Apr., 1945.
- Titulo de gobernador y capitán general de la provincia de Honduras, a favor de don Pedro Carrillo de Zayas en lugar de don Francisco Martínez de Rivamontan Santander [1634]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July.
- T. E. TREUTLEIN. The Relation of Philipp Segesser [concl.]. *Mid-Am.*, Oct.
- Documentación inédita sobre la pacificación de las fronteras de Pánuco, Villa de Valles, Guadalcázar, Nuevo Reino de León, Provincias de Coaguila y Texas y fundación de las ciudades y villas de San Francisco de Güemez, Soto la Marina, Horcasitas, Sierra Gorda, Burgos, San Antonio de Padilla, Llera, Camargo, Revilla, Reinos y Nuevo Santander, en Nueva España (hoy Estados Unidos Mexicanos). Año de 1748. *Rev. Arch. Nac.* (Bogotá), Oct., 1944.
- Reales servicios que a Su Magestad tiene hechos el capitán don Salvador de Villavicencio en la Nueva España en la conquista de la neuva colonia y costa del seno mexicano, siendo Virrey, gobernador y capitán general de Nueva España el excmo. señor don Juan Francisco de Güemez y Horcasitas. Año de 1750. *Ibid.*
- José GÓMEZ. Cosas memorables de la ciudad de México [1789-94]. *Hijo Prodigio* (México, D. F.), Nov.
- Del estado noble en Costa Rica durante la colonia. Demanda entre doña Catalina Carrilo y don José María Gutiérrez sobre esponsales que éste tenía celebrados con doña Ana Josefa Zespedes, hija de aquella [1795]. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica* (San José), Sept.
- JULIA KATHRYN GARRETT. Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814 [cont.]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct., Jan.

## SPANISH SOUTH AMERICA

## ARTICLES

- HORACIO VILLANUEVA URTEAGA. Cajamarca, ciudad incasica y colonial. *Rev. Geog. Am.* (Buenos Aires), Sept.
- JOHN J. JOHNSON. The Spanish Horse in Peru before 1550. *Greater America*.
- RAÚL PORRAS BARRENECHEA. Gonzalo Pizarro. *Bol. Soc. Geog. Sucre*, May.
- JOSÉ A. DEHEZA. La fundación de la ciudad de "Ntra. Señora de los Buenos Aires." *Ibid.*
- SANTOS JURADO. "El Milagro" o la fundación de Santiago de León de Caracas. *Rev. Nac. Cult.* (Caracas), July.
- GWENDOLIN BALLANTINE COBB. Potosí, a South American Mining Frontier. *Greater America*.
- BELISARIO MATOS HURTADO. Apuntaciones y documentos para la historia de Pamplona. *Bol. Hist. Antig.* (Bogotá), May.
- MARIO ACEVEDO DÍAZ. Retablo histórico de Zapotoca. *Estudio* (Bucaramanga), Aug.
- MANUEL BELAUDE GUINASSI. La encomienda en el Perú [cont.]. *Mercurio Peruano*, supplement, June.
- TULIO FEBRES CORDERO. Apuntes históricos.—Las minas de oro de Mérida. *Bol. Arch. Hist. Prov. Mérida*, Jan., 1945.
- HUMBERTO VÁSQUEZ MACHICADO. El hacendista Aguirre en la historia económica de Bolivia [cont.]. *Económica Boliviana* (La Paz), Aug.
- RAÚL PORRAS BARRENECHEA. El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega. *Mercurio Peruano*, Sept.
- ROBERT HALE SHIELDS. The Enchanted City of the Caesars, Eldorado of Southern South America. *Greater America*.
- MARION A. HABIG. The Franciscan Provinces of South America. *Americas*, Oct.
- ALFREDO VÁSQUEZ CARRIZOSA. La Universidad de los Criollos, ensayo sobre las condiciones

intelectuales en la Nueva Granada y su influencia en el siglo XVIII. *Rev. Mex. Soc.* (México, D. F.), May.

JAMES STEWART CUNNINGHAM. Spanish Colonization in Patagonia, 1778-1783. *Greater America*.

JORGE R. ZAMUDIO SILVA. Para una caracterización de la sociedad del Río de la Plata (siglos XVI a XVIII). La contribución africana. Conclusiones. *Rev. Univ. Buenos Aires*, Apr., 1945.

#### DOCUMENTS

Archivo de Indias. Peticiones y licencias [1582]. *Bol. Hist. Antig.* (Bogotá), May.

ENGEL SLUITER. Francisco López de Caravantes' Historical Sketch of Fiscal Administration in Colonial Peru, 1533-1618. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.

El virrey de Santafé dicta medidas en beneficio de la agricultura y especialmente de la industria triguera [1774]. *Bol. Arch. Hist. Prov. Mérida*, Jan., 1945.

Real cédula de 1777 que autoriza y dá instrucciones para establecer la renta de tabaco en Venezuela. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), May.

Para la historia de Ríoacha. Informe de don Juan Sámano, gobernador de la Provincia de Río de la Hacha. Marzo 26 de 1808. *Rev. Arch. Nac.* (Bogotá), Oct., 1944.

#### BRAZIL

##### ARTICLES

WALTER SPALDING. O Brasil na cartografia e na lenda. *Rev. Inst. Hist. Geog. Rio Grande do Sul* (Porto Alegre), II trim., 1945.

BASÍLIO DE MAGALHÃES. O açúcar nos primórdios do Brasil colonial [cont.]. *Brasil Açucareiro* (Rio de Janeiro), Aug., Sept.

JOÃO PEREIRA. Tiradentes. *Rev. Acad. Paulista de Letras* (São Paulo), Sept.

JOSÉ HONÓRIO RODRIGUES. Agricultura e economia açucareiras no século XVIII [cont.]. *Brasil Açucareiro*, Aug., Sept.

JAMES B. WATSON. Historic Influences and Change in the Economy of a Southern Mato Grosso Tribe. *Acta Americana*, Jan., 1945.

#### NATIONAL PERIOD

##### MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

##### ARTICLES

THOMAS EDWARD DOWNEY. Central America under Mexico, 1821-1823. *Greater America*.

ADELE OGDEN. New England Traders in Spanish and Mexican California. *Ibid.*

ROBERT J. PARKER. Larkin, Anglo-American Businessman in Mexican California. *Ibid.*

PETER GERHARD. Baja California in the Mexican War, 1846-1848. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

WALTER M. LANGFORD. Santa Anna and the Pastry War. *Southwest Rev.*, Fall.

FÉLIX SALGADO. Noticia biográfica del gral. don Luis Bográn. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July.

F. PEREZ ALCALA. La inauguración del ferrocarril a Tizimín, el último riel de la división de oriente. Datos históricos. *Yikál Maya Than* (Mérida), Nov.

##### DOCUMENTS

Para la antología de la independencia de Nicaragua. El diputado à cortes por Nicaragua D. José Antonio López de la Plata propone á la regencia del reino la erección de una capitania general formada por las provincias de Nicaragua y Costa Rica. Años de 1812 y 1813. *Rev. Acad. Geog. Hist. Nicaragua* (Managua), Aug.

Documentos relativos a Francisco Picaluga, 1830. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.

Anales parlamentarios. Asamblea ordinaria del estado de Honduras. Año de 1830, 1831. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July, Sept.

La Unión Centroamericana en 1846. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica* (San José), July.

Mensaje que el presidente provisional de Honduras, doctor don Marco Aurelio Soto, dirigió al

congreso extraordinario de la república, solemnemente instalado el día 27 de mayo de 1877 [cont.]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.* (Tegucigalpa), July, Sept.

## CUBA, THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, AND HAITI

## DOCUMENTS

Letter of Monsieur B. Jusmac, Secretary General of Haiti, to Mr. Joseph L. Smith, of Frederick, Maryland, February 26, 1829. *Americas*, Oct.

## SPANISH SOUTH AMERICA

TUCUMÁN EN LA ORGANIZACIÓN NACIONAL. Por *Humberto A. Mandelli*. [Publicaciones del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Núm. XC.] (Buenos Aires, Peuser, S.A., 1945, pp. 29, xxx, 3.)

## ARTICLES

- RUBÉN DARÍO RESTREPO. Causas filosóficas y políticas que prepararon la independencia. *Univ. Católica Bolivariana*, Aug.
- VICTOR F. SCHROETER. Miranda—1809. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.* (Caracas), Apr., 1945.
- VICENTE LECUNA. La guerra a muerte. *Ibid.*
- ENRIQUE DE GANDÍA. Conmemoración del 162° aniversario del natalicio del libertador Simón Bolívar. *Rev. Mil.* (Buenos Aires), Aug.
- ALFREDO JÁUREGUI ROSQUELLAS. El general Sucre y los franciscanos de Chuquisaca. *Bol. Soc. Geog. Sucre*, May.
- J. ROBERTO PÁEZ. Homenaje al Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.* (Quito), Jan., 1945.
- CARLOS A. VIVANCO. El centenario de Sucre en Venezuela. *Ibid.*
- ANGEL OSSORIO. Rivadavia. *Cuadernos Americanos* (México, D. F.), Nov.
- Centenario de Bernardino Rivadavia. Trabajos de la Junta ejecutiva de homenaje popular. *Bol. Mus. Soc. Argentino* (Buenos Aires), July.
- JOSEFINA SAPENA PASTOR DE GRAND. Actuación de la mujer argentina en la guerra de la independencia. *Rev. Mil.*, Sept.
- ENRIQUE GAY-CALBÓ. José Artigas. *Rev. La Habana*, Nov.
- MIGUEL A. CAMPA. José Gervasio Artigas, libertador del Uruguay. *Ibid.*
- JULIO TOBAR DONOSO. Antecedentes del tratado de 1829.—Capítulos IX, X, XI y XII. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.* (Quito), Jan., 1945.
- Homenaje a Sarmiento. *Cuadernos Americanos*, Sept.
- ENRIQUE ANDERSON IMBERT. El historicismo de Sarmiento. *Ibid.*
- JOSÉ ARCE. Tradición internacional argentina, el arbitraje amplio. *Anales Acad. Ciencias Econ.* (Buenos Aires), III, no. 1, 1945.
- HUMBERTO A. MANDELLI. Constituciones del Tucumán. *Bol. Fac. Der. Soc. Univ. Nac. Córdoba*, Mar., 1945.
- MANUEL DEL ALCÁZAR. Fábula y certidumbre de García Moreno. *Rev. Arch. Nac. Costa Rica* (San José), July.
- ALEJANDRO GALVIS GALVIS. Rasgos biográficos del general Julio Guarín Estrada. *Estudio* (Bucaramanga), Aug.
- FERNANDO DE LA VEGA. La constitución del 86.—Su proceso íntimo. *Ibid.*
- JAVIER GOMENSORO. Proceso social y económico del Uruguay. *Rev. América* (Bogotá), Nov.

## DOCUMENTS

- Reacción realista de 1812 y campaña admirable de 1813. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), Mar., 1945.
- Cinco comunicaciones ineditas del Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho [1822]. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Hist.* (Quito), Jan., 1945.
- BARTOLOMÉ DESCALZO. General D. José de San Martín, el libertador [cont.]. *Rev. Mil.* (Buenos Aires), Aug., Sept., Oct.

BRAZIL

ARTICLES

- CIRO T. DE PADUA. Princípios económicos vigentes no Brasil nas duas décadas do século XIX. *Bol. Bibl.* (São Paulo), Oct., 1944.
- ALBERTO LAMEGO. Os fazendeiros de campos, no século passado [cont.]. *Brasil Açucareiro* (Rio de Janeiro), Aug., Sept.
- MANUEL DUARTE. Dois estudos farroupilhas. *Rev. Inst. Hist. Geog. Rio Grande do Sul* (Porto Alegre), II trim., 1945.
- Id.* Tentativa emancipacionista. *Ibid.*
- JOSÉ MARIA DA SILVA PARANHOS JR. Esboço biográfico do general José de Abreu, barão do Serro Largo. *Ibid.*
- LAWRENCE and SYLVIA MARTIN. Brazilian Boom Town [São Paulo]. *Interamerican*, Jan.
- JOSÉ R. CASTRO. Brasil, reserva universal. *América* (La Habana), July.

DOCUMENTS

- Dois ofícios de Alfonso Mabilde [1850] (Introdução do Prof. Walter Spalding—Notas do dr. Manuel Duarte). *Rev. Inst. Hist. Geog. Rio Grande do Sul* (Porto Alegre), II trim., 1945.

## The Association in 1945

THE last meeting of the American Historical Association under the conditions enforced by World War II was held in Washington, December 27, 1945. In August the Executive Committee had canceled a two-day meeting with program. Travel and hotel accommodations then, and materially unchanged later, justified their action. But the Association has business to transact and officers to elect and install. The alternative to a full program meeting was to repeat in 1945 the pattern of 1942, when the meeting was likewise scheduled for Washington. This meant one day of activity covering a meeting of the Council, a business meeting, and the annual dinner with the address of the outgoing president. This could be managed and was managed successfully.

One cannot quite report an annual meeting in a paragraph. Certainly a year of activity and the summary of the Council's business claim the interest of all members. In the following pages the year's work is reported and the minutes of the meeting of the Council and of the Association laid before the members who could not attend the record of the year's business.

There remains only one session for which no minutes were kept—that is, the annual dinner at the Willard Hotel. Three local reporters earned their dinners and part of their salaries by taking notes. Over two hundred members and friends were free to enjoy the program. Dr. Waldo G. Leland, director of the American Council of Learned Societies and secretary of this Association “in the old days,” was the presiding officer. Members present and members who attended the great dinner on the fiftieth anniversary of the Association, at which Dr. Leland presided, have had a common and most pleasurable experience. After recalling another annual meeting in the Willard in times more peaceful nationally and more militant in the Association, Dr. Leland prefaced his introduction of President Hayes by reminding the Association of its distinguished record in furnishing historians as ministers plenipotentiary or ambassadors. Before President Roosevelt pressed Professor Hayes into service as ambassador to Spain, the country had been served by such members as George Bancroft, Andrew D. White, James B. Angell, and William E. Dodd, and our president in 1921 was the resident ambassador of France, J. J. Jusserand.

The presidential address, which was printed in the January issue, was most warmly applauded, recalling to one member's mind the outstanding reception given Professor Cheyney's address in 1924 at Columbus on “Law in History.”

The dinner was notable for the announcement of the first award of the Watumull Prize of five hundred dollars to the author of the best book on India pub-



lished during the last five years. The prize was awarded posthumously to Ernest J. H. Mackay of London, England, for his volume *Chanhu-daro Excavations, 1935-36*. The members of the committee making the award were Professors Harry J. Carman, Robert L. Schuyler, and Taraknath Das.

The Beveridge Memorial Prize of two hundred dollars was awarded to John Richard Alden of the University of Nebraska for his book *John Stuart and the Southern Frontier*, with honorable mention to Harvey Wish of Western Reserve University for his *George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South*.

#### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR FOR THE YEAR 1945

No one could regret more than the Council and your executive officers that this first postwar meeting of the Association is of necessity a truncated meeting without the usual program. The decision to cancel the program was made in August on the eve of the Japanese surrender. Everything that has occurred since has confirmed the wisdom of the decision in August. It is believed now that the Council and the membership can look forward to a resumption in 1946 of national meetings with program and joint sessions with our affiliated societies. The executive office is already in touch with some of the latter with a view to a full-scale session in New York a year from now. This is as it should be in a national association of scholars, all of whom should in some way bear responsibility for its activities. Had it not been for the work of some of the committees and the use of the mails for correspondence, plus the contacts with resident and visiting historical scholars, your Executive Secretary would have felt decidedly isolated in the Bedford stone towers of the Library of Congress Annex.

Despite these unavoidable limitations I am happy to report that the affairs of the Association and of its organ, the *Review*, are in a healthy condition. In every sense both have more than held their own. The treasurer's report reveals a financial condition such that we can consider the investment of a surplus in current balances in such a way as to increase the capital investment of the Association.

Equally encouraging are the statistics on membership. The Association now has the largest membership in its history, a total on December 15 of 3,812. This represents a gain of 184 over last year despite a loss by death, resignation, and dropping of 161 names. This means that we have had during the year an addition of 345 new members. A considerable part of this addition has come through discriminating solicitations from the office and helpful suggestions received from the membership. Three members have distinguished themselves by suggesting groups of names from their classes or interested individuals among their acquaintance. A larger number of members than usual have come wholly unsolicited, so far as I know, and indicate that interest in history or the *Review* have been quiet forces. Unless during the next year members take it upon themselves to help out the

efforts made from the executive office, this record cannot be maintained. With such co-operation it can be bettered. Every graduate student majoring in history should have the work of the Association and the character of the *Review* brought to his attention. The executive office will follow up such efforts by university teachers and seminar leaders by invitations to membership if names of possible young scholars are sent in. To do this is not, I hope, an uncongenial task to those who are instilling a professional and lifelong interest in their students. It is, moreover, a definite service to the students. I can testify that among the many reasons for a lifelong gratitude to Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles Homer Haskins is the fact that in my first graduate year they brought me into membership in this Association. It is not too much to ask now for a renewal and extension by all members, whether teachers or not, of this interest in the importance of historical study and in the Association and the *Review* as major agencies for deepening the historical background against which must be projected the problems of our present and future.

Before leaving the subject of membership it is fitting to recall that among the thirty-one of our associates who have died in the past year nine were life members. Two, Carl Becker and Max Farrand, were past presidents, and among the others were such well-known names as Dixon Ryan Fox, Clyde A. Duniway, Howard L. Gray, Roger Merriman, William A. Oldfather, and Albert Ten Eyck Olmstead. Each of them in his own way, as teacher, scholar, or exponent of American culture, had enriched the lives of multitudes through voice or printed page.

The inflow of contributions to the *Review* and the selection made by the editor with the aid of the referees he has found helpful in forming his judgment are summarized below.<sup>1</sup> Excellent articles have also been directed to more appropriate learned journals. There have been perhaps fewer futile productions offered than usual and fewer still have sought to tell the wide world through the columns of the *Review* how pivotal in American history was the career of one of their ancestors or a local hero. Lincoln, Wilson, Jefferson, and Franklin are still the great figures that in this era have become subjects of fresh interpretation both in books and articles. In the matter of a few weeks three articles on Lincoln, all worthy essays, came to the desk. I had to tell their authors that for the time being, in view of the space devoted to Lincoln recently, the editor had had to declare a moratorium on

<sup>1</sup> Volume L of the *Review* (Oct., 1944-July, 1945) contains 917 pages, including an annual index of 29 pages, as compared with 853 pages in Vol. XLIX. The total number of articles, notes and suggestions, and documents is 18, as compared with 21 in Vol. XLIX. Vol. L contains 199 reviews as against 219 in Vol. XLIX, and 212 notices as against 189, a total of reviews and notices of 411 as compared with 408 in Vol. XLIX. During the period from September 1, 1944, to September 1, 1945, 79 articles, notes and suggestions, and documents were submitted. Of these, 18 were accepted, 60 declined, and 1 is under consideration. Twelve major articles were published, including the presidential address. Of these, five are in the field of American history, five in European history, one in ancient history, and one on diplomatic relations. Of the notes and suggestions, one deals with American history in Great Britain, another with history and the Social Science Research Council, and a third with U. S. foreign relations. There are two documentary contributions in American history, and a third, the Bryce-Jameson correspondence, defies classification.

Lincoln articles. Please note that I say for the time being. On the other hand, such a field as ancient history has made no offerings. Almost as unrepresented by any significant article is the field of American colonial history. Here, perhaps, the historians in the latter field are pausing to reassess their own research not as local history but as part of the history of the Atlantic community of an earlier day.

As the Managing Editor of your *Review* I should like to take the occasion to distill from my letters the things I find myself saying most often to possible contributors. There is always the subject of effective organization, the want of which disfigures many ambitious efforts and betrays the lack of careful thought. More frequent is the essay pockmarked with old overworked phrases, the cliché that once had punch but should now retire from the ring. Apropos of nothing he had seen in the *Review* a member recently solicited my aid in suppressing a figure of speech that had stirred him when he first heard it and then again the first time he saw it in print but now seemed a threadbare ancient that met him at every turn. I offered my membership in an anti-cliché association operating on a broad front but reminded him that to each new generation the old in English speech was as fresh as it once was to him and that it takes time and effort to realize how rich and eclectic the English language is. Rather than form an association with a negative purpose, one that enlisted young writers and old in the positive purpose of acquiring a vocabulary by wide reading and reflection would be worth forming in the Modern Language Association and among the teachers of journalism as well as in the American Historical Association. A bolder soul than I am might try his hand at such an organization among economists, sociologists, and educationalists. Recent vigorous writing and speaking by scientists on the atomic bomb suggest that something similar in the field of the social sciences and humanities might turn academic neutrons into irradiant cultural positrons.

And now to return to my editorial desk. The writer of a paper as brief as those in the *Review* has three things to keep in mind. His presentation should yield something to the specialist in the field, either by the exploitation of new sources, the rereading of old sources, or the synthesis of a familiar into a new interpretation. At the same time he must remember that he is also through the *Review* reaching a large and growing audience of nonspecialists including the Board of Editors and the Managing Editor outside their own fields. He should seek to enlist their attention and enable them to see what it is he and his fellow specialists consider worth discussing. If he seeks to do it by the meretricious tricks of the popular writer who lives off the learning of others, he will fail. I have turned back essays that tried it. I have declined them if for no other reason than that I did not want the young writer to have that kind of albatross hanging around his neck for the rest of his career. The third thing is the factor of perspective or background or relationship. The segment of scholarship that is offered should fit into some larger whole more or less familiar to his reader. By allusion, by the whole tenor of his treatment, as well as by the choice of his subject the essayist must suggest that

he and the reader are moving from largeness toward largeness and not following a path into thick woods and up a tree and into a squirrel hole. Having said these things I resist the temptation to go farther in a discussion of the training and self-training that American historians of the future must undergo in obtaining that breadth of cultural interest, that backward and sideward view that will make them what they must be in increasing measure, the interpreters and prompters to a people that has mumbled its half-understood history in the wings and is now thrust in the center of the world stage to play a role for which they have not been too well prepared.

No one person, certainly no one with many other inescapable duties, could adequately survey and report annually on the state of historical studies in the United States. I can only record the impression derived from my contacts as Executive Secretary confined to Washington and from the flow of material that comes in for the appraisal of the critics that conscientiously serve the *Review* and its readers. Despite the inroads of war upon productive scholarship and the seminars deserted for wartime service of every kind the net impression is that there has been a healthy activity and a respectable published production. If one subtracts the hasty and evanescent books and articles that war and the first impact of the problems of an uneasy peace produce, there remains a reasonable body of titles likely to survive as worthy of attention. Any year is not lost that sees the concluding volumes of two solid series such as that devoted to Canadian-American relations and to the social history of the United States, the conclusion of a protracted singlehanded survey of the history of the expansion of Christianity, the continuation of the many-volumed survey of the British Empire in the quarter century before the American Revolution, another volume of the scholarly edition of Cromwell's writings and speeches, two erudite volumes of biographies in Chinese history, a challenging reinterpretation of the Jackson era, two volumes of ripe scholarship on the first years of Lincoln as President, a well-labored study of the American agricultural frontier, and numerous biographic and semimonographic studies of Woodrow Wilson and the tragic failure of his struggle for an idea that will not die. These volumes, and others you will think of, must be reckoned to the permanent credit of American historical scholarship in 1945. Beyond and behind these achievements, the year has seen an effort incomparably more serious and inclusive than in 1918 to cover the history of the nation's war effort in the struggle just closed and of its impact, measured at the moment, upon the nation's life. For a survey of the studies projected and under way in the various wartime and old-line government agencies concerned with the war see page 607 below. These studies have engaged the efforts of many with historical training and many trained in allied fields. The product will be uneven, the outcomes uncertain because of the turnover in staffs. The published results will be delayed by a host of unsolved problems. By reason of their historical staffs and persisting interest, the Army, Navy, and Air Forces seem to be in the best position to come through with histories that

will have the necessary monographic and documentary underpinning and the final synthesis by well-known historians. These services are foremost in the public mind when war history is mentioned; they have the most at stake in presenting their story and the most to learn professionally from the objective histories their official directives call for. In many civilian agencies there has been sympathetic interest despite shortage of funds and trained historical staffs. In others, responsible topside officials have been stupidly indifferent or uncomprehending and even hostile. On rare occasions unthinking and premature orders to destroy records have had to be reversed. Much paper must go unregretted to the salvage pile, but it is hoped that discrimination will save the records necessary to an objective historical assessment of every important agency. Furthermore, there should be steady and intelligent effort to make available the record by reclassification of material now under restrictions. The biggest business of the American people for four years has been war, and the books should be opened for the benefit of the nation that labored in it.

One record made for the American Historical Association by the Historical Service Board was closed on December 31 when the Board went out of existence. One study room in the Annex and one staff member on part time have been retained for a few months until the last discussion pamphlet approved by the Board and the War Department is through the press. When the Japanese war ended, the education and information branch of the Army agreed with the Board officers on a fifty per cent cut in the topics under preparation, keeping in the first line those already far advanced. The total list issued, about forty-four in all, is printed in the Council minutes, page 590 below. We shall turn back to the Treasury a considerable sum, although the monthly payments on this year's contract were only one third of what they were in the last fiscal year. The files of the Board as part of the archives of the Association will be deposited with the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. The record is a highly creditable one and the War Department, through General Frederick Osborn and Colonel Francis Spaulding, has voiced not once but often their appreciation of the Association's co-operation in this part of the Army program of mass education. The Council has expressed to the individual members of the Board and to its staff its own word of commendation for the way in which they have discharged the commission given them in September, 1943. Not all of the Board were members of the American Historical Association but all have been jealous guardians of the good name of the Association which stood sponsor for their work.

The remainder of this report for 1945 consists of the usual summary of the reports of the various committees of the Association. The reports were reviewed by the Council and made the subject of appropriate action. They will be printed in full in the *Annual Report*.

For the past three years a number of the committees have been stalled or in low gear because of war conditions. Some of the committees have not been active

this year. That is true of the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize Committee, which makes awards only in the even-numbered years. The chairman, Professor J. Duane Squires, will seek the co-operation of his university colleagues and others in locating suitable books and manuscripts for the award in 1946. The chairman of the Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize reports that no manuscripts have been submitted and the committee has, therefore, no report to make. The announcement of the awarding of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Prize appears elsewhere (p. 575 above). The committee had a total of fifteen works (ten books and five manuscripts) to pass on. The John H. Dunning Prize Committee makes its award in even-numbered years and has no announcement to make this year. Professor Ragatz reports as follows for the Committee on the *Annual Report*:

Volume I of the *Annual Report* for 1943, containing the Association's proceedings, the Pacific Coast Branch report and a report on the Conference on Latin American History, all for 1943, has been distributed during the past year.

Volume II of the same report, containing *Writings on American History for 1939 and 1940* (a double volume), is still being indexed from page proof, not much progress having been made during the past year, as Mrs. Dorothy Louraine, Miss Griffin's only assistant, resigned to return to the teaching profession. It is unlikely that it will be distributed before the close of this calendar year.

Volume I of the *Annual Report* for 1944, containing the Association's proceedings for 1944, the Pacific Coast Branch report for 1944, a report on the 1944 Conference on Latin American History and Professor Franklin B. Scott's classified abstracts of articles in the fifty volumes of the *American Historical Review*, 1895-1945, just completed, is in final page proof and will be distributed at an early date. Volumes II and III, containing a *Calendar of American Fur Company Papers, 1831-1849*, prepared under the auspices of Dr. Grace Lee Nute, in lithoprinted form, are in advanced stages of manufacture and will also be distributed shortly. Lithoprinting is an innovation in publishing the *Annual Report* and was resorted to in this instance because the ribbon copy of the original manuscript was available while no funds were available for proofreading a letterpress job. The work has been nicely done and should prove acceptable to the membership, which would otherwise have been deprived of this invaluable material for the study of American economic history.

A printing credit of \$10,620 again became available for the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945. Revised figures on Volume I for 1944 and the estimate on Volume III for 1944, charged against this credit, leave a book balance of \$5,971.25 as of this day, which sum will probably be reduced to \$5,500 by the time final bills on all volumes currently in manufacture, which generally involve additional charges, are in.

Plans for the *Annual Report* for 1945 have not been entirely completed, as the committee is awaiting the course of events on certain matters. It appears certain, however, that there will be no volume of *Writings* to include in the *Annual Report* for 1945 as it is understood that the whole matter of the future of this publication will shortly be considered by the Council. Matteson's consolidated index to the *Writings* through 1938 is steadily taking shape but will not be ready for printing before the calendar year 1947. . . .

Volume I for 1945, the usual proceedings volume, will be prepared as soon as



possible after the December meeting. It will contain a new membership list, revised up to the latest possible date before publication.

For the Committee on the Beveridge Memorial Fund the chairman, Professor Arthur P. Whitaker reports that the series of documentary volumes has been brought to a close by the publication during the year of Easterby's *The South Carolina Rice Plantation as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston* (see p. 516 above). Bernstein's *Origins of Inter-American Interest* (see p. 524 above) has appeared as the third issue of a new series of monographic studies. The fourth volume, Pomeroy's "The Territories of the United States, 1861-1890," is being editorially revised for the printer. There are no further manuscripts under consideration at present.

The committee has borne the expenses of the editorial work in the preparation of the *Writings in American History* but has no editorial or publication responsibility for the *Writings*. Violent fluctuations in amount from year to year for the editorial fees has been a matter that embarrassed the committee in controlling its budget.

The committee estimates with some reservation that including normal income they could prudently count upon a balance of \$22,000 for 1945-46. They purpose that from this sum \$7,000 be transferred to principal bringing the endowment of the Beveridge Fund up to \$100,000. The committee recommends the following complete revision of their program:

(1) that an "Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship" be established, to be awarded annually by this committee over an experimental period of five years for the best manuscript submitted in a given year, to have a cash value of \$1,000, together with assurance of publication of the manuscript in the Beveridge series, and to constitute the core of a more flexible publication program; (2) that \$7,500 of the Beveridge Fund's present balance be earmarked for the support of this plan; (3) that approximately \$7,000 be transferred from the remainder of this balance to the principal of the Beveridge Fund in order to bring the latter up to \$100,000; (4) that this committee be relieved of responsibility for maintaining the Beveridge Prize; and (5) that the committee be informed of the probable future financial responsibilities of the Beveridge Fund for the *Writings in American History*, and that the Council appoint a committee to study the whole problem of the *Writings*.

The Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund has found its task considerably reduced by wartime conditions. Only two manuscripts were submitted. One was declined and the other is still under consideration. Professor Louis G. Hunter's volume, "An Economic and Technological History of Steamboating on the Western Waters in the Nineteenth Century," accepted by the committee of 1944, is being printed by the Cornell University Press and should appear early in 1946. The Committee on Legal History under the chairmanship of Professor Philbrick has been steadily at work. The Rhode Island volume and the one on South Carolina are still in preparation. Active co-operation by the Maryland historians and

lawyers indicates that a new volume will follow the one edited by Chief Judge Carroll T. Bond. The Committee on Government Publications, Dr. Jeannette P. Nichols, chairman, did its part in promoting the passage of the bill to authorize completion of the territorial papers. Its further interest will be revealed in a resolution to be introduced later. Under the Committee on Radio the historians and the National Broadcasting Company continue to give an admirable historical background for current major questions. In the past year "The Story behind the Headlines" was for the month of April broadcasting from SHAEF, presenting history in the making on battlefields as seen by the representative of the committee of a learned society. A special committee appointed by the Council last year to look into the possible exploitation of the WPA annotated bibliography of United States history has not been able to meet this year. The chairman takes the responsibility and one who knows how burdened he has been this last year can readily accept his plea in abatement. The committee will stand and expects to report next year.

The reports of the representatives on the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies will be published in full in the *Annual Report* for 1945. Both show that these organizations have been keenly alive to the interests of scholarship in the social sciences and the humanities during the war and are planning wisely to meet the problems of the postwar world.

The report of Professor Destler on *Social Education* indicates a gratifying increase in subscribers and a program of rigid economies that is putting this periodical in a stronger financial position. One paragraph from his report directed to members of this Association merits their attention.

An especial problem for the American Historical Association has developed from the failure of its members to contribute articles suitable for publication in *Social Education* in sufficient quantity and variety. It will be recalled that this periodical is the successor to the *Historical Outlook*, which for years had been the professional journal of history and civics teachers in the schools and which had enjoyed effective support from historians in the universities and colleges. When the Commission on the Social Studies, set up by the American Historical Association, sponsored the establishment in its place of a periodical to service the entire social studies field, surely no one anticipated that historians would let the field of history go very largely by default in the articles offered to the new journal at a time when the position of history in the revised curriculum of the schools would be a very, very live issue. It is an ironic fact that this has come to be the case.

Aside from some attention to American history, very little has been offered to the editor during the past year that would enable him to present to school teachers and teacher-training institutions the new viewpoints, interpretations, and discoveries accruing in all fields of history as the result of recent research, publication, and development of new areas.

This report has dealt with the affairs of history in 1945. No citizen and certainly no historian can be unconscious of the fact that for centuries to come America and the world will be concerned with 1945 in history. He is indeed a dullard

who does not realize that the span of his brief years may be the poet's "age on ages telling." Humanity is making its first run through a maze such as never trapped it before. There are many possible turnings, many blind alleys. Let us not be of little faith, we who have the long perspective of history. We know that something there is in man's nature that does not love the walls of despotism and that rises renewed from the bonfires of bigots. We have seen the terrible depths to which mankind can sink. These revelations we forget at our peril as historians, but as historians let us hold and expound our faith in the future renewed and uplifted by those who have died in our own day and in all ages that the deathless good in our common kind might yet hold sway.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, CONFERENCE ROOM, THE  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
DECEMBER 27, 1945, 10:00 A. M.

Present: Carlton J. H. Hayes, President; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Ralph H. Gabriel, Roy F. Nichols, Carl Stephenson, Sidney B. Fay, Ralph H. Lutz, Councilors; Solon J. Buck, Treasurer; Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary; Arthur P. Whitaker, Chairman, Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund Committee; Louis K. Koontz, Pacific Coast Branch.

President Hayes called the meeting to order.

Upon motion the minutes of the 1944 meeting of the Council and of the annual business meeting (which had been published) were approved without being read.

Mr. Ford summarized his report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor.

The Treasurer's report was then presented by Mr. Buck. The following matters were made subjects of special discussion and action:

1. It was voted that the Council authorize the Finance Committee to authorize the Treasurer to invest the surplus funds of the Association with the general invested funds of the Association.

2. It was voted that the budget for 1946 be approved including the changes enumerated at the end.

3. It was voted that the salary of the Executive Secretary be increased from \$5,000 to \$6,000, effective as of the beginning of this fiscal year.

In the absence of Professor Aiton, Mr. Ford presented the report of the Committee on Committees and the following list of committees and delegates was thereupon approved by the Council:

*Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.*—Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex, Managing Editor; William E. Lunt, Haverford College—term expires December, 1946; A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota—term ex-

pires December, 1947; M. L. W. Laistner, Cornell University—term expires December, 1947; Thad W. Riker, University of Texas—term expires December, 1948; Curtis P. Nettels, Cornell University—term expires December, 1949; Lawrence H. Gipson,\* Lehigh University—term expires December, 1950.

*Committee on Committees.*—Charles A. Barker,\* Johns Hopkins University—term expires December, 1947; Elmer Ellis,\* University of Missouri—term expires December, 1948; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio).

*Committee on Honorary Members.*—Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies, chairman; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio); Bernadotte Schmitt, University of Chicago; Lewis Hanke,\* Library of Congress.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.*—J. Duane Squires, Colby Junior College, chairman; V. J. Puryear, 647 D Street, Davis, California; Clarence H. Matterson,\* Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

*Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize.*—M. B. Garrett, University of North Carolina, chairman; F. Lee Bennis, Indiana University; Leona C. Gabel, Smith College.

*Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize.*—Reginald C. McGrane, University of Cincinnati, chairman; Dan E. Clark, University of Oregon; Lawrence Harper, University of California.

*Committee on the Publication of the Annual Report.*—Lowell J. Ragatz, George Washington University, chairman; Solon J. Buck, The National Archives (ex officio); Richard J. Purcell,\* Catholic University; St. George L. Sioussat, Library of Congress; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio); Bernard J. Holm, 535 Kentucky Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.

*Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.*—Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Dorothy Burne Goebel, Hunter College; Philip Davidson, Vanderbilt University.

*Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications.*—Ray A. Billington, Northwestern University, chairman; Samuel H. Brockunier, jr., Wesleyan University; Raymond P. Stearns, 202 Vermont Avenue, Urbana, Illinois; Paul W. Gates, Cornell University; Grace A. Cockroft, Skidmore College; Lawrence F. Hill, Ohio State University; Chester W. Clark,\* Iowa City.

*Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund.*—Francis S. Philbrick, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; John Dickinson, University of Pennsylvania; Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University; Richard B. Morris, College of the City of New York; Mark D. Howe, University of Buffalo; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, 744 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey; Zechariah Chafee, jr., Harvard University; Richard L. Morton, College of William and Mary.

---

\*New member this year.

*Committee on Government Publications.*—Jeanette P. Nichols, 438 Riverview Road, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, chairman; Richard J. Purcell, Catholic University; Bernard Mayo, University of Virginia.

*Committee on the Watumull Prize.*—Taraknath Das, New York City College, chairman—term expires December, 1947; Harry J. Carman, Columbia University—term expires December, 1946; Tyler Dennett,\* Hague, New York—term expires December, 1948.

*Committee on Historical Source Materials.*—Committee continued for one year.—Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Association, chairman. *Special Committee on Archives:* William McCain,\* Mississippi Department of Archives and History, chairman; Emmett J. Leahy, Remington Rand Company, New York; Edwin A. Davis, Louisiana State University; Solon J. Buck, The National Archives; Charles M. Gates, University of Washington; Margaret C. Norton, Illinois State Library; Virgil Peterson,\* Colorado State Museum. *Special Committee on Manuscripts:* Lester J. Cappon, Colonial Williamsburg, chairman; Wendell H. Stephenson, University of Kentucky; Theodore C. Blegen, University of Minnesota; St. George L. Sioussat, Library of Congress; Howard Peckham,\* Indiana Historical Bureau; Francis English,\* University of Missouri. *Special Committee on Newspapers:* Louis Beeson,\* Minnesota Historical Society, chairman; Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga; A. F. Kuhlman,\* Vanderbilt University; Allan Nevins, Columbia University; Edgar E. Robinson, Stanford University; E. Malcolm Carroll, Duke University. *Special Committee on Business Records:* Thomas C. Cochran,\* New York University, chairman; Ralph M. Hower, Harvard University; William D. Overman, Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, Akron; Oliver W. Holmes, The National Archives; Lewis Atherton, University of Missouri; Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky; Herbert O. Brayer,\* Colorado State Museum; Richard Overton,\* Northwestern University. *Special Committee on Library Holdings:* Clarence Paine,\* Beloit College, chairman; Louis Kaplan,\* University of Wisconsin; James A. Barnes, Temple University; Virginia Gambrell,\* Dallas Historical Society; William Jesse,\* University of Tennessee. *Special Committee on Preservation and Restoration of Historical Objects:* Herbert E. Kahler, National Park Service, Department of Interior, Chicago, chairman; Ronald Lee, National Park Service, Department of Interior, Washington; Russell H. Anderson, Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago; Hans Huth,\* Art Institute of Chicago; C. C. Crittenden, Department of Archives and History of North Carolina; Lucile O'Connor Kellar, McCormick Historical Association. *Special Committee on Documentary Reproduction:* Captain Edgar L. Erickson, C.A.D. Information Branch, Pentagon Building, Washington, chairman; Louis Knott Koontz,\* University

---

\*New member this year.

of California at Los Angeles; C. W. de Kiewiet,\* Cornell University; Milton R. Gutsch, University of Texas; Warner F. Woodring, Ohio State University; Frank J. Klingberg, University of California. *Research Associate*: Everett E. Edwards, Department of Agriculture.

*Committee on the WPA Annotated Bibliography of United States History*.—Lester J. Cappon, Colonial Williamsburg, chairman; Charles C. Crittenden, State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina; Dan Lacy, The National Archives, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on Radio*.—Conyers Read, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Stanley Pargellis, Newberry Library, Chicago; Elizabeth Y. Webb, Washington, D.C.; Henry Commager,\* Columbia University; W. K. Jordan,\* Radcliffe College; Thomas I. Parkinson,\* New York City; Philip E. Mosely,\* Department of State, Washington, D.C.; Raymond Sontag,\* University of California; Evelyn Read (director), Villa Nova, Pennsylvania; Cesar Saerchinger (broadcaster), New York City.

*Delegates of the American Historical Association*.—*American Academy of Classical and Medieval Studies in Rome*: Austin P. Evans, Columbia University—term expires December, 1947; T. Robert S. Broughton, Bryn Mawr College—term expires December, 1947. *American Council of Learned Societies*: Wallace Notestein, Yale University—term expires December, 1946; C. W. de Kiewiet, Cornell University—term expires December, 1948. *Representative on American Year Book Supervisory Board*: Thomas C. Cochran, Washington Square College, New York University. *International Committee on Historical Sciences*: James T. Shotwell, Columbia University, Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies. *Representative on National Parks Association Board*: B. Floyd Flickinger, Bear Garden Farm, Star Route, Hanover, Virginia—term expires December, 1946. *Representatives on Social Education*: Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio); Chester McA. Destler, Connecticut College. *Social Science Research Council*: Merle E. Curti, University of Wisconsin—term expires December, 1946; Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania—term expires December, 1947; Shepard B. Clough, Columbia University—term expires December, 1948 (re-elected).

The following ad interim appointments were made during the year 1945: Professor Frank Pitman of Claremont College was representative at the twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of the Graduate School of the University of Southern California, January 25–28, 1945. Professor Elizabeth Davidson of Coker College was representative at the inauguration of Dr. Donald Charles Agnew as president of Coker College on April 28, 1945. Professor A. C. Krey of the University of Minnesota was delegate to the inauguration of Dr. Lawrence McKinley Gould as president of Carlton College on October 16, 1945. Professor Dora Mae Clark

---

\*New member this year.



of Wilson College was delegate at the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of Wilson College on October 13, 1945. Professor A. T. Volwiler of Ohio University was delegate to the inauguration of William Allison Shimer as president of Marietta College on October 20, 1945. Professor Lawrence H. Gipson of Lafayette College was delegate to the inauguration of Ralph Cooper Hutchison as president of Lafayette College on October 26, 1945. Professor David K. Bjork of the University of California was delegate to the inauguration of George Henry Armacost as president of the University of Redlands on November 4, 1945. Professor Oscar J. Hammen of the University of Utah was delegate to the inauguration of Howard S. McDonald as president of Brigham Young University on November 14, 1945. Professor J. Duncan Brite of Utah State Agricultural College was delegate to the inauguration of Franklin Stewart Harris as president of Utah State Agricultural College on November 16, 1945. Professor Herman J. Deutsch of the State College of Washington was delegate to the inauguration of Wilson Marindale Compton as president of the State College of Washington on December 11, 1945. Professor Winfred T. Root of the University of Iowa was delegate to the inauguration of Byron Sharpe Hollinshead as president of Coe College on December 14, 1945.

Next, the question of the Association's keeping a roster of the war records of members was discussed. It was decided that such a large project was of doubtful value and could not be handled by the present staff in the office of the Executive Secretary.

Reporting for the Committee on Honorary Members, of which Dr. Waldo G. Leland is chairman, Mr. Ford announced that nine of the ten honorary members elected last year had accepted the election. The tenth, Professor Johan Huizinga of the University of Leiden, died before the news of his election could be communicated to him. Mr. Ford reported that the committee felt that if honorary membership in the Association was to be esteemed as highly as it deserved, it should be awarded not only with great care but also sparingly. Accordingly, the committee recommended that the Executive Council should form a resolution to the effect that the number of living honorary members at any one time should not exceed fifteen. The Council agreed to such a resolution.

On motion the following list of honorary members was elected and the Executive Secretary instructed to inform them and in due time to send them some suitable certificate:

Gaetano de Sanctis. Commissioner extraordinary for historical studies of Italy; born in 1870; professor of ancient history in the University of Turin, 1900-1929; professor of Greek history in the University of Rome, 1929-1931; dismissed from his professorship for refusal to take the Fascist oath; president of the Pontifical Academy of Archaeology; a founder and member of the first governing board of the International Committee of Historical Sciences; mem-

ber of the International Union of Academies; honorary degree of Doctor of Laws conferred by the University of Cambridge in 1930; historian of classical antiquity. Author: *History of the Romans* (1907-1923); *History of the Athenian Republic* (1912); *Problems of Ancient History* (1932); *History of the Greeks* (1939).

Halvdan Koht. Born in 1873; lecturer and professor of history in the University of Oslo, 1908-1935; minister of foreign affairs of Norway, 1935-1941; president of the Academy of Sciences of Oslo; founder and first president of the International Committee of Historical Sciences; member of the International Union of Academies; visiting professor in Harvard University and Lowell lecturer; received honorary degree of doctor of laws from Cambridge University, 1930. Author: *Social Democracy* (1926); *Johan Sverdrupp* (1916-25); *Henrik Ibsen* (1928-29); *Old Norse Sagas* (1931); *Norway, Neutral and Invaded* (1941). Editor: *Ibsen's Letters and Posthumous Works* (1904, 1909, 1939); *Bjornson's Letters* (1912, 1921, 1932).

George Peabody Gooch. Born in 1873; honorary fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; president of the Historical Association, 1922-1925; Member of Parliament, 1906-1910; fellow of the British Academy; degree of D.Litt., Oxford. Author: *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*; *History and Historians of the Nineteenth Century*; *Political Ideas from Bacon to Halifax*; *Germany and the French Revolution*. Joint editor: *Contemporary Review*; *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*; *British Documents on the Origins of the War*.

Frederick Maurice Powicke. Regius professor of modern history, Oxford University; born in 1879; fellow of the British Academy; president of the Royal Historical Society, 1933-1937; corresponding fellow of the Mediaeval Academy of America; correspondent of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres; chairman of the Committee on the International Bibliography of Historical Sciences; honorary degrees from Cambridge, St. Andrews, Manchester, Liverpool, Harvard, and Caen; formerly professor in Queens University, Belfast, and University of Manchester. Author: *Loss of Normandy* (1913); *Stephen Langton* (1928); *Medieval England* (1931); *The Christian Life in the Middle Ages* (1935); *History, Freedom, and Religion* (1937).

The Committee on Honorary Members felt the need to increase its membership from three to five in order that the fields of Latin-American history and Slavic studies could be represented. It was voted to leave the choice of two new members to the committee itself.

Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, chairman of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund Committee, presented the report of his committee, which is summarized above in the report of the Executive Secretary (see p. 581). With two slight changes, it was voted to accept the plan of the committee as outlined, to approve the estab-

lishment of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship, and to abolish the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Prize.

Mr. Ford then spoke of the fact that an interested member wanted to give a prize for an outstanding book in Franco-American relations. It was agreed that the matter should be looked into more thoroughly.

The matter of electing the Executive Committee was postponed until after the business meeting.

Next came the consideration of the annual meeting for 1946. It was decided to follow the usual cycle of cities and call the next meeting for December, 1946, in New York City. Professor Thomas C. Cochran of New York University was made chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee and Professor Dwight C. Miner of Columbia University chairman of the Program Committee. Authority was given to the Executive Committee to modify all arrangements to fit any contingency that might arise during the year.

Mr. Ford then brought up the matter of the exchange list of the *American Historical Review*. He pointed out that certain European libraries had been receiving the *Review* up until the beginning of the war as a gift dating from 1927 when that Board of Editors made a decision to donate the *Review* for five years. It was decided that the Executive Secretary be entitled to make such exchanges or cancel such exchanges as he saw fit but that free copies would no longer be extended to the list formulated in 1927.

Since the term of J. G. Randall of the University of Illinois as a member of the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* ended in December, 1945, the Council elected Lawrence H. Gipson, of Lehigh University to replace him.

A letter from the publishers of the *Guide to Historical Literature* was presented. It was agreed that the Macmillan Company should be assured that the Association desired another printing and it should be suggested to them that a supplement might be added which would serve as a revision for the time being. The *Guide* seemed to the Council a publishing venture that could and should be underwritten by Macmillan. In about ten years a complete revision would be necessary and desirable.

The next question was the problem of the *Writings on American History*. The Council authorized the Executive Committee to set up a special committee to study the situation and make suggestions to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Ford then read a report from Stanley Pargellis on the *Bibliography of British History, 1714-1789*, which is being sponsored jointly by the Royal Historical Society and the American Historical Association. The Council agreed that the Executive Secretary should write to the Royal Historical Society and indicate the Association's approval of the manuscript, as it has now been revised by Professor Pargellis.

Upon motion it was voted that the Historical Service Board, established in

September, 1943, officially go out of existence as of December 31, 1945. The Council asked Mr. Ford to convey to the Board its appreciation of their work. Mr. Ford read the following list of pamphlets published under the Board:

1. *Can War Marriages Be Made To Work?*
2. *Do you Want Your Wife To Work after the War?*
3. *Guide for Discussion Leaders*
4. *Will the French Republic Live Again?*
5. *What Is Propaganda?*
6. *Our British Ally*
7. *What Shall Be Done with the War Criminals?*
8. *What Shall Be Done about Germany after the War?*
9. *What Has Alaska To Offer Postwar Pioneers?*
10. *Our Chinese Ally*
11. *Can We Prevent Future Wars?*
12. *The Balkans: Many Peoples, Many Problems*
13. *Shall We Have Universal Military Training* (censored)
14. *Will There Be Work for All?*
15. *Shall I Build a House after the War?*
16. *Australia: Our Neighbor "Down Under"*
17. *Why Co-ops? What Are They? How Do They Work?*
18. *What Future for the Islands of the Pacific?*
19. *What Will Your Town Be Like?*
20. *Our Russian Ally*
21. *How Shall Lend-Lease Accounts Be Settled?*
22. *Is the Good Neighbor Policy a Success?*
23. *Does It Pay To Borrow?*
24. *What Lies Ahead for the Philippines?*
25. *Shall I Take Up Farming?*
26. *Shall I Go Back to School?*
27. *What Shall Be Done about Japan after Victory?*
28. *Will There Be a Plane in Every Garage?*
29. *What Is the Future of Television?*
30. *What Makes the British Commonwealth Hold Together?*
31. *How Free Are the Skyways?*
32. *Canada: Our Oldest Good Neighbor*
33. *How Far Should Government Control Radio?*
34. *What Is the Future of Italy?*
35. *Who Should Choose a Civil Service Career?*
36. *Can the Germans Be Re-Educated?*
37. *What Shall We Do with Our Merchant Fleet?*
38. *Building a Workable Peace*
39. *Is Your Health the Nation's Business?*
40. *Are Opinion Polls Useful?*
41. *Shall I Go into Business for Myself?*
42. *Is a Crime Wave Coming?*
43. *Why Do We Have a Social Security Law?*
44. *Why Do Veterans Organize?*

At the time for new business Mr. Buck called the attention of the Council to three things: the proposal for the establishment of a United Nations Archives, the

proposal for memorials to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the appointment of a committee to form the Washington Social Science Federation. He pointed out that the Association would probably be asked to approve, although not support, a Washington branch of the American Historical Association. It was agreed that such a local organization would promote historical research co-operation here in Washington.

Professor Koontz of the Pacific Coast Branch asked the Council if the Association would pass a resolution approving Senate Bill S. 1720, "A Bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes." It was decided that he should read his resolution before the business meeting to follow and that it should be discussed there.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, CONFERENCE ROOM,  
THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.  
DECEMBER 27, 1945, 4:00 P. M.

The annual business meeting of the American Historical Association, held in the conference room of the National Archives was called to order by President Hayes, with approximately seventy members present. President Hayes called the attention of the members to the fact that this was the sixtieth annual meeting of the Association and the fifth under abnormal conditions.

Motion was made to approve without reading the minutes of the meeting in 1944, as they had already been printed and circulated.

Mr. Ford then read his report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor (see p. 575).

The Treasurer, Mr. Buck, then presented a summary of his report. Motion was made to accept the report and place it on file. Approved. (The report will be published in full in the *Annual Report* for 1945, Volume I.)

The nomination of Stanton Griffis to continue on the Board of Trustees for another term was presented, and he was re-elected by the Association. The nomination of Shepard Morgan to finish out the term of Leon Fraser, who had died during the past year, was approved. The Board of Trustees for 1946 is as follows: W. Randolph Burgess, 55 Wall Street, New York City, chairman—term expires 1946; Thomas I. Parkinson, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York City—term expires 1947; Shepard Morgan, 18 Pine Street, New York City—term expires 1948; A. W. Page, 195 Broadway, New York City—term expires 1949; Stanton Griffis, Hemphill, Noyes and Company, 15 Broad Street, New York City—term expires 1950.

Professor Max Savelle gave the report of the Nominating Committee in the absence of Chairman Loren C. MacKinney. The committee had received by December 20 a total of 1,610 ballots. A tabulation showed the election of the following from names submitted by the committee:

Members of the Council (two to be chosen)—Professor Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin and Professor A. C. Krey of the University of Minnesota.

Members of the Nominating Committee (two to be chosen)—Professor F. Lee Bennis of the University of Indiana and Professor Louis Pelzer of the University of Iowa.

For the offices of president, vice president, and treasurer the committee nominated Professors Sidney B. Fay, T. J. Wertenbaker, and Solon J. Buck respectively. Since the committee had received no petitions for alternative candidates within the prescribed time limit for written petitions, the Executive Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for those three candidates.

The Executive Secretary then reported to the Association the following actions taken by the Council at its morning meeting:

The decisions on the Committee on Committees report (see p. 583 above); the re-election of Shepard B. Clough as representative on the Social Science Research Council; the choice of four additional honorary members (see p. 587 above); the decision to increase the membership of the Committee on Honorary Members from three to five; the resolution to keep the number of living honorary members at fifteen; the report of the Beveridge Memorial Fund Committee embodying the new fellowship plan; the selection of New York City as the place of the 1946 meeting and the decision to leave the choice of a Program Committee chairman and a Local Arrangements Committee chairman to the Executive Secretary in consultation with members in New York City; the report of the Committee on the *Annual Report*; the election of Lawrence H. Gipson of Lehigh University to the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review*.

Professor Mazour, the representative from the Pacific Coast Branch, then read the report of Hardin Craig, jr., the secretary. It indicated that the affairs of the branch were in a healthy condition. It has a membership of 364 including 33 libraries. Two one-day meetings will be held in January, 1946, one at Stanford University and the other at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. Regular meetings will be resumed at the end of 1946.

Mrs. Jeannette P. Nichols presented for the Committee on Government Publications the following resolutions, which were unanimously approved:

WHEREAS, The American Historical Association always has evinced keen interest in publication of the documentary record of American foreign policy, as exemplified in such series as the Department of State's *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*: and

WHEREAS, America's foreign relations now have acquired an importance unprecedented in our history, thus making an expanded publication program a prime necessity: now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Historical Association make known to the Secretary of State and to appropriate committees of Congress its lively interest in the whole field of the Department's documentation, and urgently request the Secretary of State to facilitate the publication of all basic papers on World War II and



its origins and causes, and of all available data on every important aspect of our current foreign policy consistent with national security, in order that those who interpret and teach American diplomacy may have the accurate and full information requisite for their duties.

WHEREAS, It has been the general practice of Presidents of the United States, upon retirement from the White House, to take with them considerable bodies of records, official as well as personal: and

WHEREAS, The Federal Government now possesses admirable facilities for the expert care and servicing of all official files, and the use of them is essential to scholars and government officials for intelligent performance of their functions in our democracy: now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Historical Association express, and give full publicity to, its earnest hope that, henceforward, our chief executives may take with them upon retirement only that correspondence which is strictly personal in character.

WHEREAS, President Truman, in his Executive Order No. 9568 of June 8, 1945, has provided for the release, through declassification, of scientific and technical data "to the end that such information may be of maximum benefit to the public": and

WHEREAS, Declassification is essential in the fields of the social sciences and the humanities, no less than those of the natural sciences: now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Historical Association through its officers urge upon the Director of War Mobilization and upon other officials controlling declassification, that, as rapidly as comports with national security, they release not only the scientific and technical data but also that in the fields of the social sciences and humanities.

On the call for new business Professor Koontz of the Pacific Coast Branch presented a resolution on Senate Bill S. 1720. After debate on the floor led by John H. Powell it was voted to refer the resolution to a committee to consider, reformulate, and send to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs. The resolution as redrafted by a committee consisting of Professor Max Savelle, chairman, L. K. Koontz, and G. S. Ford follows:

WHEREAS, There has been introduced on December 21, 1945, by Senators Kilgore, Johnson, Pepper, Fulbright, and Saltonstall, in the Senate of the United States, Senate Bill S. 1720, "A Bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes," in short, a bill to establish a "National Science Foundation"; and

WHEREAS, During the month of October extensive hearings were held on an earlier draft of this bill, at which representatives from the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, the American Political Science Association, the American Council on Education, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Guggenheim Foundation, the American Economics Association, the National Education Association, and other organizations supported those provisions of the bill that look to the encouragement of research, training, and publication in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Historical Association urges the passage of this Bill, with its provision for the encouragement of research, training, and publication in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, and commends the open and fair manner in which the Senate Subcommittee on War Mobilization conducted the hearings.

On motion the meeting adjourned.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

SECOND MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, CONFERENCE ROOM, THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 27, 1945, 5:00 P. M.

The Council met at the conclusion of the business meeting and elected the following members as the Executive Committee for 1946:

Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University, chairman; Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania; Sidney B. Fay, Harvard University; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio); Solon J. Buck, The National Archives (ex officio).

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

## American Historical Association

The chairmen of the Local Arrangements Committee and the Program Committee, Professors Thomas C. Cochran and Dwight C. Miner, have fixed the dates of the annual meeting for 1946 as December 27, 28, and 30 in New York City. Headquarters will be at the Hotel Pennsylvania.

The attention of members is called to the perforated tear sheet ballot at the end of this section. It is added to this issue as an aid to the Committee on Nominations in its effort to provide an opportunity for members to indicate their preferences. The committee asks your co-operation in this experiment.

It is with regret that we announce that despite the best laid plans the Government Printing Office failed to print extra copies of Part II of Volume I of the *Annual Report for 1944*. This is the section containing the digest prepared by Professor Franklin Scott of all articles in the first fifty volumes of the *American Historical Review*. The Superintendent of Documents placed his order for five hundred offprints to be sold. This office had asked for a limited number. All this was done last October. Through an oversight these orders were mislaid and the type distributed. It is unfortunate that the usually reliable government printers should have slipped on a matter of more than usual importance. The only recourse of those not on the mailing list for the annual reports is to ask their congressman

or senator for a copy. A few copies are set aside for each member of Congress. These are usually surplusage from his point of view.

At its meeting in Washington on December 27, 1945, the Council of the American Historical Association established the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship, to be awarded annually, beginning in 1946, for the best original manuscript, either complete or in progress, on American history. By American history is meant the history of the United States, Latin America, and Canada. The fellowship has a cash value of \$1,000, plus a royalty of five per cent after cost of publication has been met. The winning manuscript in each annual competition will be published without cost to the author in the series of Beveridge Fund publications; other manuscripts also may be so published at the discretion of the Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, which is charged with the administration of the fellowship. As small a part as one half of the manuscript may be submitted at the time of application, but it must be accompanied by a detailed outline of the balance. The deadline for the submission of applications and manuscripts in the first year of competition (1946) is September 1, 1946. For full details and forms of application, address Arthur P. Whitaker, Chairman, Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund of the American Historical Association, 208 College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

## Other Historical Activities

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: document purporting to be letter of Christopher Columbus to Juan Luis de Mayo, December 28, 1504; photostats and transcripts of memorial of Father Alonso de Benavides, Franciscan, regarding missions in New Mexico, February 12, 1634, and related documents; unpublished manuscript of "Liure de guerre Contenant Soixante plans. . . Dedié Au Roy par le sieur d'Aurignac, Marechal de Bataille A Paris 1663"; photostats of four papers of the Hayden family of Connecticut, April 11, 1696, to April 7, 1888; seventeenth century manuscript copy of Cortes' Fourth Letter to the King of Spain, first published in 1525; copy of letter from Brown Willis to John Hampden, April 29, 1738, and genealogical chart of the Hampden family, 1825; letter from Joseph Farell and Nephew to Daniel Parke Custis, November 29, 1749, with endorsement in the hand of George Washington on the verso; six additional papers of James McHenry, 1776 to 1814; photostat of letter from George Washington to Nicholas Cooke, April 3, 1777; letter from George Washington to [ ], November 24, 1777; photostat of a muster roll of Captain Samuel Sands, Berks County, Pennsylvania, April 23 to May 23, 1781, and typescript introductory statement by Margaret R. Waters, November 8, 1945;

photostat of letter from John Blair to Benjamin Harrison, Governor of Virginia, January 4, 1782; about two hundred papers of Andrew Ellicott, 1784-1829; microfilm of a ledger kept by William Seaton or Oliver Crawford, Muddy Creek, Pennsylvania, 1793 to 1795; letter from John Quincy Adams to [ ] Le Ray, Nov. 23, 1794; forty-eight letters of Rebecca Gratz, mainly to Maria Fenno Hoffman, 1797 to 1804 and 1860; ninety additional papers of the Shippen family, mainly 1798 to 1855; seven Mexican legal documents including twenty-three colored drawings of Indian towns, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; sixteen letters and notes (one volume) pertaining to William Blake, mainly 1804 to 1880; one hundred and eleven additional papers of Alfred Mordecai, mainly 1822 to 1885; letter from Zachary Taylor to Thomas Lawson, August 28, 1828; letter from John Quincy Adams to Joseph Blunt, editor of the *American Annual Register*, January 16, 1830; authorization of Andrew Jackson to the Attorney General of the United States on a matter of debt, February 24, 1834; manuscript account of Andrew Johnson with Mordecai Lincoln for tailoring and other items, March 12, 1835 to June 13, 1836; letter from Andrew Jackson to Henry Toland, September 9, 1835; photostat of message sent out by William B. Travis during the siege of the Alamo, February 24, 1836; diary of Tobias Purrington of Maine, one volume, February 10, 1837, to May 10, 1841; eighty-three additional papers of A. A. Low and Brothers, largely relating to trade with China, September 15, 1842, to July 16, 1849; photostats of additional papers of William Gregg, mainly 1843 to 1872; photostat of letter from Y. E. Garvin and other citizens of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, to Thaddeus Stevens, September 10, 1844; seven letter and account books of Philippine Islands and Boston merchants, Lorenzo Margati and José Margati, 1845 to 1855 and 1865 to 1887; diaries (two volumes) kept by James M. Hutchings, May 19, 1848, to December 31, 1855; photostat of letter from Daniel Webster to Daniel Webster Fessenden, July 26, 1849; journal by Robert Danby of a cruise in the United States steam frigate *Mississippi*, November 24, 1852, to April 22, [1855]; seven letters from Franklin Pierce to members of his family, 1854 to 1865; papers of James Petigru Boyce, one volume and seventeen other items, mainly 1854 to 1888, and 1907; six additional letters from John Fiske to members of his family, March 31, 1867, to June 3, 1887; two letters from Herbert Spencer, February 29, 1868, and January 15, 1869; letters, transcripts of letters and related papers, Henry James to Sir Edmund Gosse, 1882 to 1920; autograph fragment of Walt Whitman's "Specimen Days"; minute book of the Brooklyn Republican Club, Brooklyn, New York, January 30, 1896, to May 25, [19]03; letter from John J. Pershing to Edward Rosewater, April 17, 1898; eleven letters from Henry James to George Harvey and others, June 2, 1899, to September 6, 1907; one hundred and eighty-seven additional papers of Mira Lloyd Dock, mainly 1899 to 1945; letters from William Howard Taft to Willis Fletcher Johnson, June 25, 1908, to November 24, 1908; shorthand statement by Woodrow Wilson, with transcription, relating to the choice of a United States Senator from

New Jersey, December 8, 1910; additional papers of Woodrow Wilson July 5 to August 14, 1914 (restricted); photostat of a letter from Albert Einstein to Mrs. [ ] Whitney, July 15, [19]26; forty-six letters from John Masefield to Muriel Walthew, 1932 to 1934; photostat of signed reading copy (with autograph corrections) of speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt, at Washington, D. C., September 17, 1937; letter from M. A. deWolfe Howe to the Right Reverend J. W. Atwood, November 18, 1940; twenty-two pieces of correspondence of Howard O. Eaton and ten drafts of a proposed Constitution of the United Nations, with marginal notes by Mr. Eaton, 1940 to 1942; papers of William E. Dodd (restricted); letter from Joseph C. Grew to Archibald MacLeish, February 8, 1945; typescript prepared by Florence W. Layton, "Brief Annals of Senator Charles Cutts and His Family with Some of Their Letters," 1945; unpublished manuscript (two notebooks) by Donald Culross Peattie, "Flowering Plants of Kennicott's Grove"; three additional papers (typescripts) of Katharine Hayden Salter.

The *Eleventh Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States* for the fiscal year 1944-1945, just published, describes the part played by the National Archives in handling records problems at home and abroad during the last full year of World War II. With the smallest staff it had had since 1938, the agency could not deal as effectively as it might have with the ever-increasing mass of government records. Major attention was given to the war agencies likely to be terminated soon after the end of hostilities. By accessioning their valuable records, facilitating the disposal of those no longer of value, and planning for the eventual disposition of all their files, the records of war agencies were brought under some measure of control. Altogether, from old-line as well as emergency agencies, the National Archives received nearly 74,000 cubic feet of records during the year, bringing the total in the custody of the archivist on June 30, 1945, to more than 689,000 cubic feet. Reference service still had to be rendered on a restricted basis but a number of special services, such as furnishing information and assistance to the military authorities in the protection and utilization of records in occupied areas, were performed. Copies of the *Eleventh Annual Report* may be obtained upon request. Another publication of the National Archives recently issued is *Putting PAW to Bed: The Records Retirement Program of the Petroleum Administration for War*, by Frances Bourne. Now that the war is over, the National Archives can once again take orders for file microcopies. The program to reproduce on microfilm bodies of records of outstanding research value and to provide positive prints to the public at cost was begun in 1940 but was hampered by wartime reductions in staff and the scarcity of materials. Nevertheless, during the past five years some 1,400 rolls of file microcopies have been made.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library has acquired eighteen notebooks of Franklin Roosevelt containing schoolboy exercises and compositions in writing,

grammar, arithmetic, history, French, and German, done during the years 1890-1893, when their author was from eight to eleven years old. With the notebooks was received a record of the grades earned by him in these subjects, kept by his governess during the period in question and enlivened by her comments on the progress of her charge. A stenographic transcription of a little-known extemporaneous talk by Mr. Roosevelt on the subject of regionalism in its relation to state planning, delivered at the University of Virginia's Institute of Public Affairs, in Charlottesville on July 6, 1931, has been received from Mr. Clarence Ascher of New York.

The reference department of the Library of Congress has now completed Volume I of the *United States Quarterly Book List*. Many competent reviewers have co-operated in characterizing briefly the chief books to be called to the attention of foreign scholars and libraries. The publication has its value also for like groups in this country. Moreover, it is welcome as an indication of the library's recognition of its responsibilities in taking the lead nationally in preparing and publishing bibliographical aids. This venture is distributed by the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office for \$1.25 per year.

A committee of the American Library Association concerned with aid to libraries in devastated areas has compiled and published a pamphlet, *Books Published in the United States, 1939-1943*. The selection of the 1,406 titles was made by the editor, Charles F. McCombs of the New York Public Library and his committee, with the aid of committees and specialists in all fields enlisted by the leading learned societies. Some thirty-five sets of all titles have been stock-piled for distribution to selected libraries strategically located in the devastated areas. American history is represented by 87 titles, history outside America by 132, and historical auxiliary sciences by 16. A comparable list of 1,000 titles was prepared in England by a committee under the chairmanship of Sir Ernest Barker. The final choice in America was made with a view to furnishing a reference library rather than a specialists' library. The result is, however, an acceptable blend of both points of view.

*Living in the United States: A Guide for New Visitors* is the title of a booklet issued by the Committee on Friendly Relations among Foreign Students (347 Madison Avenue, New York 17, price 10 cents). It is meant chiefly for students and technical trainees who have come to the United States for the first time and contains sections on "Travel in the United States," "Learning about Daily Living," "First Steps in Understanding American Community Life," and "Some Social Customs."

*Who's Who in Latin America: A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Living Men and Women of Latin America* is to be published in seven parts by the Stan-



ford University Press. Part II, *Central America and Panama*, has become available recently. Part I, *Mexico*, and the other parts will be published as soon as ready. *Who's Who in Latin America* was initiated by the late Professor Percy A. Martin of Stanford University. The current edition, which is the third, will be approximately four times as large as its predecessors.

The Social Science Institute of Fisk University (Nashville 8, Tennessee) offers for teachers, research students, social workers, and administrators a selection of "human documents," consisting of hitherto unpublished interviews, autobiographical narratives, religious conversion experiences, letters, personal-racial experiences and attitudes, and cultural adjustment experiences. These documents have been gathered over the past fifteen years by the research staff of the Social Science Institute and are grouped and classified but unedited. Each set of documents has a brief introduction explaining the source and character of the materials, and offering a broad conceptual framework for their interpretation. They are mimeographed and securely bound. The volumes now available in limited numbers are as follows: (1) *Unwritten History of Slavery* (322 pp., \$3.00), autobiographical accounts of Negro ex-slaves. (2) *God Struck Me Dead* (218 pp., \$2.50), religious conversion experiences and autobiographies of ex-slaves. (3) *Racial Attitudes* (270 pp., \$3.00), interviews revealing attitudes of northern and southern white persons of a wide range of occupational and educational levels toward Negroes. (4) *Oriental and Their Cultural Adjustment* (138 pp., \$2.50), interviews, life histories, and social adjustment experiences of Chinese and Japanese of varying backgrounds and length of residence in the United States. (5) *Social World of Negro Youths* (298 pp., \$2.50), interviews with southern Negro youth on personnel, social, and racial adjustment experiences.

The University of Rochester Library announces the gift of a large and important part of the Thurlow Weed Collection which has been on deposit in Rush Rhees Library on the River Campus for several years. The donors are Mrs. Harriet Weed Hollister Spencer of Rochester, Mrs. Elizabeth Hollister Frost Blair of Tarrytown, and Mrs. Isabelle Hollister Tuttle of New Haven, great-granddaughters of Thurlow Weed, nineteenth century American political leader. The gift comprises twenty volumes of original letters, about 1,300 financial records and miscellaneous manuscripts, 12 volumes of early American newspapers, and several volumes of scrapbooks, pamphlets, and books relating to Thurlow Weed's career.

A history of Indiana University during World War II is being prepared by Professor Oliver P. Field.

The Library of Congress has commissioned the American Printing House for the Blind to record a Talking Book edition of *Contemporary America: The National Scene since 1900* (Harper and Brothers, 1945) by Harvey Wish. This work,

financed by congressional appropriation, involves forty-five double-side Vinylite discs read by radio announcers and artists and is distributed free-of-charge to libraries for the blind throughout the nation.

The *Smith College Studies in History* completed, by the end of 1945, thirty years of continuous publication. During that period they published fifty-five books and monographs. Twenty-one of them concerned American general, social, and cultural history; ten, the social and economic development of the Connecticut Valley; four, United States foreign relations and diplomatic history; seven, English history, medieval and modern; and eleven, European history, ancient through modern. Of the two remaining studies, one, by Harold J. Laski, dealt with "The Problem of Administration Areas" and the other with the history of the Smith College department of history and government from 1875 to 1920. The *Smith College Studies in History* aim primarily to afford a medium for publication by present and former members of the Smith College faculty and by former students of the college.

Since 1941 the Steamship Historical Society of America has published a Reprint Series. The last (No. 3) is *Iron and Steel Hull Steam Vessels of the United States, 1825-1905* by John H. Morrison, prepared for reprinting with foreword and index by Lieutenant Commander Alexander C. Brown, USNR. Copies may be obtained at fifty cents each from James T. Wilson, Circulation Manager, 138-30 Northern Boulevard, Flushing, New York.

The Historical Society of Delaware has sent forth the first issue of a new periodical, January, 1946. It is a highly creditable number. The two main articles are listed elsewhere. Writers of local history would profit by reading and reflecting on the opening paragraphs of the article by J. H. Powell on "John Dickinson, President of the Delaware State, 1781-1782."

The first issue of *Chicago History*, a little quarterly published by the Chicago Historical Society, appeared in the fall of 1945. Editor Paul M. Angle describes it as "an informal publication devoted in the main to the Society's museum, library, and activities." Copies are distributed only to members of the society, a group which hopes to grow rapidly.

Eight awards under the Library of Congress program of grants-in-aid for studies in the history of American civilization have been announced. The grants were established by the Rockefeller Foundation. Recipients of the grants, and their projects, are: Samuel F. Bemis, Yale University, "John Quincy Adams and the Foundation of American Foreign Policy"; Carvel Collins, Harvard University, "The Spirit of the Times in the United States, 1831-1861"; Dorothy A. Dondore, Iowa City, Iowa, "The Rise and Fall of the American Desert"; Howard

N. Doughty, jr., Englewood, New Jersey, "The Forest Drama—Parkman as Creator"; Eric F. Goldman, Princeton University, "A Study of Modern American Liberal Thought"; Thomas P. Govan, Sewanee, Tennessee, "Biography of Nicholas Biddle"; Frances T. Schwab, St. Louis, Missouri, "A Study of the Origins of Modern Household Design in the Victorian Age in America"; and Charles S. Sydnor, Duke University, "Trends in Southern Political Leadership, 1783 to the Present."

The Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, announces that it has taken over the fellowship program of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and is prepared to provide a limited number of grants-in-aid of research in the field of early American history and culture to the year 1815. These grants will be available to those who have a definite project of research in progress. Applications must be received by May 1, 1946; announcements of awards will be made June 1, 1946. Information and forms for application may be procured from the Director of the Institute, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The Mayflower Cup Award, which is presented annually by the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the state of North Carolina for the most distinguished literary work by a resident of the state, has been awarded for 1945 to Josephus Daniels for *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace*, which was published by the University of North Carolina Press.

Alfred W. Stern, trustee of the Illinois State Historical Library, is offering prizes for outstanding essays on Illinois or Illinoisans in the Civil War. Winning essays will be published in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*. Mr. Stern is giving \$100 for the first prize and \$50 for the second. Authors of other articles deemed satisfactory for publication in the *Journal* will be paid \$25 by the society. The essays should contain approximately 5,000 words. The subject may be any phase of the Civil War era in Illinois, or any activity, military or civilian, of Illinoisans anywhere outside the state or abroad. The articles will be judged by three leading historians. The judges will make their selections on the basis of originality of research, contribution to the knowledge of Civil War history, and readability. Inquiries concerning the contest should be addressed to J. Monaghan, Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois. All entries must be submitted by December 31, 1946.

At the meeting of the executive council of the National Association of Teachers of Speech held in Columbus, Ohio, on December 26, 1945, the association's committee on the history of American public address was authorized to receive, compile, and publish reports of research in progress in the history of American public address. The office of the chairman of the committee will be a clearing-house for such information. Interested students and scholars are requested to write to Pro-

fessor Bower Aly, Chairman, Committee on the History of American Public Address, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

The first working historical society in North Carolina was founded just a century ago. The University of North Carolina was founded in 1795, just a century and a half ago. This double association of historic dates gives unusual appropriateness to the revival at this time of the Historical Society of North Carolina, a society with the same name as the organization which ceased to function about 1915. The new organization is state-wide in its appeal and bears a charter list of members who are well known as scholars, writers, and teachers. A constitution and bylaws have been adopted, and the elected officers are Dean Alice Baldwin, Duke University, president; Dr. Frontis Johnston, Davidson College, vice-president; Dr. Cecil Johnson, University of North Carolina, secretary-treasurer; and the following members of an executive council: Dr. Archibald Henderson, University of North Carolina; Dr. C. C. Crittenden, director of the State Department of Archives and History; Mr. William T. Polk, Greensboro; and Dr. J. W. Patton, State College.

The history department of the University of Pittsburgh held a one-day conference on November 16, 1945, devoted to a discussion of science and technology in American history and historiography. The conference was attended by twelve prominent American historians, and ten historical representatives from the armed forces. The civilian historians were Professors Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard, Ralph H. Gabriel of Yale, R. G. Albion of Princeton, Shepard B. Clough of Columbia, Dwight L. Dumond of Michigan, J. Fred Rippy of Chicago, Paul H. Gates of Cornell, A. T. Volwiler of Ohio, Stanley Pargellis of Newberry Library, S. C. Gilfillan of Chicago, Paul H. Giddens of Allegheny College, and Robert D. Gregg of Carnegie Institute of Technology. Professor Rippy read a paper at the noon luncheon, entitled "The Technological Invasion of South America." Professor Schlesinger gave the main address at the dinner meeting, choosing for his subject "An American Historian Looks at Science and Technology." Plans were made for holding another conference next year.

The history department of the University of Pittsburgh has signed a contract with the United States Army to write the official history of the military planning division of the United States Quartermaster Corps for the second World War. Professor John W. Oliver is directing the work, with Professor John Geise serving as chief historian, in direct charge of the project in Washington and Chicago, aided by a staff of ten research assistants in the history of science and technology. The work is to be completed within two years.

The American Association for State and Local History held its fifth annual meeting November 7-8, 1945, in Indianapolis. In the same week (November 6-8),

in the same place, was the annual conference of the Society of American Archivists. Several of the sessions were held jointly. At a dinner meeting on November 8, Miss Dorothy Barck of the New-York Historical Society, delivered her address as president of the Association for State and Local History. One afternoon's meeting was devoted to the problems of writing the history of World War II and to the effect of the war on the West. Twenty-four states and the District of Columbia were represented in the attendance.

## Personal

Bit by bit the outer world is learning the tragic story of what happened to the intellectuals in the countries occupied by the Nazi gangsters. A letter to Dr. Waldo G. Leland from Professor Otakar Odložilík, who has returned from Princeton to Prague, tells something of what has happened to the historical scholars in Czechoslovakia:

It would take too long to enumerate the heavy losses which our learned world suffered under the occupation or in the past few months. You have heard of the death of Prof. Josef Šusta, who for many years served on the international committee and helped in editing the international bibliography. In August, 1945, Prof. K. Krofta, formerly Minister of Foreign Affairs, passed away, his health having been broken in the dreary cells of Theresienstadt. The executive committee, as elected before Munich, almost disappeared. Two of the three vice-presidents lost life: Prof. Vladimír Groh, Masaryk University, was executed, and Dr. Jaroslav Papoušek was tortured to death in a concentration camp. Two honorary secretaries, Prof. Bedřich Mendl and Docent Josef Matoušek, both of Charles university, are no more with us. The former left this world of his own will, as a victim of the Nürnberg laws; the latter was shot with students on November 17, 1939. Finally, our honorary treasurer, Dr. Bedřich Jsnšovský, who for many years worked in the Vatican archives, was put to death in the concentration camp of Oświęcim. It would hardly be possible to paint a more gloomy picture!

The letter then goes on to tell of the reorganization of the Czechoslovak Historical Society, of their plans and of their eagerness to be once more in touch with historical scholars in other lands. There is tragedy in the story of the dead historians, but there is inspiration in the spirit with which the survivors are carrying on.

There will be no learned journal in the fields of history and the social sciences here or abroad that does not record with regret, as does the *American Historical Review*, the news of the death on February 8 of Edwin F. Gay in Pasadena, California. His profound learning in the field of economic history, his broad scholarly interest in cognate subjects, his public service in Washington in 1917-1918, the vigor of his mind, and the impact of his personality upon many worthy scholarly

enterprises made him a constructive force in the nation's intellectual life for the past forty years. He was a graduate of the University of Michigan in 1890 and a doctor of philosophy with high honors of the University of Berlin in 1902. With the exception of his service in Washington in the first World War and three years as president of the New York *Evening Post*, his career was associated with Harvard University, 1902-1936, and the Huntington Library since 1936. In the former, as dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration he laid solid foundations, then returned to his professorship of economic history. He stimulated and trained young scholars and gave to others from his own learning. He found time to play a leading part in the founding of the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Bureau of Economic Research, and the Social Science Research Council. He shunned rather than sought administrative responsibility, yet any scholarly or public enterprise that enlisted him made its first sure step toward success. He disseminated learning and was the most helpful critic a producing scholar could have, but his own printed output was relatively slight. Its quality merited and received the praise of foreign and American scholars. He was a life member of the American Historical Association, a member of the American Philosophical Society and the recipient of honorary degrees from Harvard, Michigan, Northwestern, Tulane, and the University of Manchester, England.

William A. Morris, professor emeritus of English history in the University of California, died February 20. Few names in the field of history have been longer or more honorably connected with scholarship on the Pacific Coast and in the University of California than that of Professor Morris. The industry and care he spent on his publications had given him a solidly based reputation among students of medieval and English constitutional history. Professor Morris was born in Oregon, May 24, 1875. He was Carnot medalist at Stanford University, where he received his A.B. in 1901. He was in turn Austin and Tappan fellow at Harvard, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1907. He began his college teaching in the University of Washington (1907-1912); and then followed his long service in the University of California, interrupted only in 1921 by a year as special lecturer in King's College, University of London. He published special studies of frankpledge, the English county court, and the medieval English sheriff. He collaborated with J. F. Willard on the volume for 1327-1336 in the series *The English Government at Work*. His substantial volume on *English Constitutional History* covers the period to 1216. He was honored with membership in learned societies and had contributed notes and reviews to this journal.

Word has come of the death in January of the German historian, Herrmann Oncken. As a young man of thirty-six he was visiting professor of history in the University of Chicago. He was one of the few leading German historians who took his stand with the Weimar Republic. He gave up his professorship in Berlin some



ten years ago when his published study of Cromwell, with its barbed allusions to dictators, set the pack of Nazi historians in full cry against him. He retired to the university city of Göttingen, where with men like Friedrich Meinecke he awaited a better day for scholarship.

Reverend Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., a member of this Association, died February 9, 1946, at St. Meinrad's Abbey in Indiana at the age of sixty-one. Brother Gaul had been active as educator and as editor of St. Meinrad historical essays.

The Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Bonner, treasurer-general of the National Catholic Educational Association, president of the Catholic Educational Association of Pennsylvania, and superintendent of Catholic schools in the diocese of Philadelphia, died November 27 at the age of fifty-five.

Professor Alfred Martineau, former colonial governor, professor of colonial history at the Collège de France, famous authority on Dupleix and French India, long president of the Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, and editor of *La Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises* since its foundation, died in Dordogne on January 25, 1945, after a two-year illness. This comes from his daughter, who advises that no issue of the *Revue* has appeared since 1940. A meeting of the officers of the Société has been planned for an early date to arrange for carrying on.

Ralph H. Gabriel will go to the University of Sydney in Australia for two terms beginning June 10 as visiting professor of American history.

Paul H. Buck, who has been serving as dean of Harvard College, has recently been made provost of Harvard University. He was chairman of the committee on the objectives of a general education in a free society.

Charles P. Stacey, on leave of absence from the department of history of Princeton University for war service with the Canadian army, has been chosen to write the official history of the Canadian army in World War II.

Richard H. Heindel, formerly assistant professor of modern European history at the University of Pennsylvania, has been named acting chief of the new division of libraries and institutes in the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

David C. Duniway has accepted appointment as the first state archivist of Oregon. He began his duties on January 5.

Jay Monaghan, historical research editor in the Illinois State Historical Library since 1939, has been appointed by the library's trustees to the position of state his-

torian, a post recently vacated by Paul M. Angle. He is at present preparing for publication the library's unique collection of papers on the Black Hawk War.

Theodore C. Blegen, dean of the graduate school of the University of Minnesota, delivered the Charles M. and Martha Hitchcock lectures at the University of California in January on "Folk Culture and Immigrant Transition." He also lectured in the University of California at Los Angeles.

Edward P. Alexander, formerly superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, has accepted appointment as educational director of Colonial Williamsburg. Mr. Alexander entered on his new duties February 1, 1946.

Edward S. Corwin, McCormick professor of jurisprudence in Princeton University, delivered the Cook Lectures at the University of Michigan in January.

John Rydjord of the University of Wichita is spending the current academic year at the University of California at Los Angeles as visiting professor of Hispanic American history.

Theodore Saloutos has been appointed lecturer in history at the University of California in Berkeley.

J. E. Wallace Sterling of the California Institute of Technology has been appointed Edward S. Harkness professor of history and government.

Koppel S. Pinson of the department of history of Queens College of the City of New York has been granted a leave of absence to proceed to Germany and Austria and administer a program of education for displaced persons.

Wentworth Morris, formerly professor of history in Arizona State College, Flagstaff, is now a member of the history department in Oregon State College. Dr. C. K. Smith has been appointed associate professor in the same institution.

C. Hulley, formerly of Oregon State College, has accepted a position as acting head of the history department at the University of Alaska.

Bernard Brodie is now an associate professor in the Institute of International Studies at Yale University.

Arthur E. Bestor, jr., formerly on the faculty of the school of humanities at Stanford University, is now an associate professor in the department of history in the same institution. His special field of interest is the intellectual history of the United States.

Chester H. Kirby, department of history, Brown University, has been promoted to an associate professorship.

John H. Kemble and John H. Gleason have been promoted to associate professorships at Pomona College.

Sydney H. Zebel has been appointed assistant professor in the department of history and government of the University of Newark.

Richard J. Hooker has accepted an appointment as assistant professor and chairman of the history department in Roosevelt College, Chicago.

Roland G. Usher, jr., has been appointed assistant professor of history and political science in Butler University.

## Communications

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

At your request I am submitting a brief report of the status of our war history projects.

The past few months have seen the completion of war history projects in a few of the war agencies, the initiation of active work in several agencies and substantial progress in many others. Historical projects are now under way in about forty agencies.

The first agency to publish a final historical report was the Office of Censorship. This agency terminated its activities on November 15, 1945, and published through the Government Printing Office a 54-page *Report on the Office of Censorship* summarizing its organization and operations throughout the existence of the office. More detailed material on the same subject was left by the office as part of its official records; while much of this material will remain confidential for some time, a useful record of the difficulties and successes of wartime censorship has been captured and will be preserved.

Other material, printed or otherwise reproduced, is becoming available. The Civilian Production Agency (formerly War Production Board) is about to issue in printed form the minutes of the National Defense Advisory Commission, the Office of Production Management Council, the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, the War Production Board, and the WPB Planning Committee. The agency is also preparing to release in multilithed form sixteen studies of special reports on commodity groups and policy problems, to be followed by several other studies later. A two-volume general history of the program and administrative activities of the War Production Board is also being prepared.

The programs of the War and Navy Departments, which have been extensive and active through the war period, are continuing. The Navy Department is completing a considerable number of reports on its bureaus and its activities, most of them for restricted circulation. Plans are being made for the eventual publication of over-all historical material and certain special studies. A series of articles entitled "The Navy: A Study in Administration" appeared in the autumn issue of the *Public Administration Review* and has been reprinted in booklet form by the Public Administration Service. A series of operational reports entitled "American Forces in Action" will be published by the Army through the Government Print-

ing Office. Two of these, *Salerno* and *The Papuan Campaign* have already appeared. The Army is planning a substantial publication program covering all important operational and administrative activities.

General historical studies covering agency operations as a whole are under way in most of the agencies and are already progressing toward completion in several. In addition a number of agencies have arranged for the preparation of historical reports on each of their bureaus or divisions; the Smaller War Plants Corporation has already deposited a set of such reports in the National Archives in typewritten form. New historical officers have recently been appointed and programs are being accelerated in the Office of Price Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Departments of Commerce and Justice, Civil Service Commission, and Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

As the historical projects take shape, it is possible to see, somewhat more clearly than in the past, the nature of the contribution that will come from the work that has been done and the activities that will continue for some time to come. There will be several kinds of material, each useful in its own way. The over-all agency histories will be, for the most part, accounts of policies and operations of interest to the general student rather than to the meticulous researcher. Many agencies will prepare, as a step in the production of their published histories, longer and more detailed histories which will contain a great deal of valuable material for future research workers. (While some of these studies will have to be restricted in their circulation for the time being, the facts will have been put into a narrative record and thus preserved.) In a number of agencies, intensive studies have been made of special topics and the resulting reports will be available for the most part in typescript at the National Archives, the Library of Congress, the Budget Bureau, and the originating agency. Agency files of preliminary materials and the general files of the historical offices will also represent a contribution by providing in somewhat processed form information useful for specialized research. In total, the documentation of our experience in this war will provide readers with published material and scholars with source material to a degree that has not been previously approached, either as to volume or as to systematized usefulness.

*War Records Section,  
Bureau of the Budget*

PATTERSON H. FRENCH, *Chief*